DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 152

EC 030 026

AUTHOR	Hoffman, John L.
TITLE	An Investigation of Factors Contributing to Successful and Non-Successful Adjustment of Discharged Retardates.
INSTITUTION	Pineland Hospital and Training Center, Pownal, Maine.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Research and Demonstration Grants.
PUB DATE	Sep 69
NOTE	350p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.50 HC-$17.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjustment (to Environment), Adults, *Exceptional Child Research, *Followup Studies, Institutionalized (Persons), Longitudinal Studies, *Mentally Handicapped, Personal Adjustment, Prediction, Rehabilitation, Social Adjustment, Vocational Adjustment, Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

Presented is a longitudinal followup study some 4-10 years later of 569 mentally handicapped adults discharged from the Pineland Hospital and Training Center. Described are the setting in which the research was done (the institution, the field, and the State of Maine), relevant literature, the methodology of the data collection and analysis, and the results. Statistical analysis revealed predictive relationships among factors related to the period prior to discharge for successful and non-successful divisions of the categories of post-discharge behavior. These categories considered were: presence or absence of police contact, self-support ability, wage levels, stability of interpersonal ties, and marital status. Implications of the results for theory and practice are discussed. Accompanying the report and separately bound are two documents: the "Tabular Supplement," giving a statistically descriptive longitudinal picture of many aspects of subjects' lives, and the "Biographical Supplement", giving specific personal illustration of various types and levels of post-discharge conditions. (KW)

EC030026

ED0 43152

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER
BOX C, POWNAL, MAINE 04069

PETER W. BOWMAN, M.D.
SUPERINTENDENT

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

JOHN L. HOFFMAN, Ph.D.

REPORT ON PROJECT RD-1606-P

TO THE
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

EC 030 026 E

+6

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FOR REHABILITATIONS AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

This is a longitudinal follow up study of discharged retardates some 4 to 10 years after they had left the institution. Statistical analysis identified predictive relationships among factors of the period from birth to institutional discharge for successful and non-successful divisions of several types of post-discharge behavior, separately considered. Categories considered were: presence and absence of police contacts; full and partial (or no) self support since discharge; relatively higher and lower wage levels; greater and lesser stability of interpersonal ties. Also investigated was marital status.

Discriminant function analysis produced rates of predictive identification that ranged as high as 80%. Supplied in the text are formulae for applying these findings to other institutional dischargees. Long-range predictive identification is seen of value in aiding decisions for the selection of discharged retardates for various programs and services in order to arrive at the best routes for maximizing their potential for community adjustment. A conservative view would note the need for retesting these findings for other populations. Predictive instruments should be used with caution, to avoid the dangers of treating changeable or incorrect predictions as inevitable realities.

A Tabular Supplement, separately bound, accompanies this report. It gives a statistically descriptive longitudinal picture of many aspects of subjects' lives from birth to time of post-discharge follow up interview. It should provide resource material on the pre-discharge phases, and information on the ranges of post-discharge personal, social, and employment activities that might be realistically expected of similar dischargee populations.

A Biographical Supplement, separately bound, also accompanies this report, and gives quite specific personal illustration of a number of types and levels of post-discharge conditions. Some of these can serve as examples of adjustments that are more ideal goals to be worked toward, while others delineate less than desirable adjustments and some of the problems and difficulties that beset members of this unique dischargee population.

Upon too many of the dischargees have been left the marks of unusual trauma and psychosocial deprivation in infancy and childhood, along with the experience of dismal custodiality in the years before new philosophies and new policies sought to restore the retarded to meaningful and useful lives in the community. A special awareness of the formative years of these and similar institutional dischargees is required for relating personally with them and for helping them to plan realistically for social and economic goals that are attainable in the framework of their limitations, potentialities, and sometimes emotionally and cognitively crippling heritages. A need for relevant services and resources is recognized for insuring optimum direction of post-discharge process.

Unfortunate social backgrounds provided the etiologies for the conditions of many of these subjects. Early preventive work in the community with underprivileged and impoverished children and their families would undoubtedly go far in avoiding that downward spiral of trauma and inept treatment that so often can lead to psychosocial retardation.

EC030026

ED0 43152

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

RD-1606-P

Peter W. Bowman, M.D.
Project Director

John L. Hoffman, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator & Author

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER
Box C
Pownal, Maine 04069

September 30, 1969

This investigation was supported, in part, by
Research Grant No. RD-1606-P from the
Division of Research and Demonstration Grants
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C., 20201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STAFF

Project Staff at Pineland

Peter W. Bowman, M.D.	Project Director
John L. Hoffman, Ph.D.	Principal Investigator & Author
A. J. Pappanikou, Ed.D. succeeded by H. Jay Monroe, Ph.D.	Co-Director
Anthony L. Meucci	Finance Officer
Lucille H. Dwinal, B.A.	Interviewer
Barbara A. Britten, B.A.	Interviewer
Hildegarde H. Ayer, B.A.	Interviewer
Kathleen Casey, B.A.	Interviewer
Dorothy H. Jones	Office Staff
Theresa M. Clement	Office Staff

Consultants

Ruby Jo Kennedy, Ph.D.	Sociology
Seymour B. Sarason, Ph.D.	Psychology
Kathleen O'Donoghue, M.S.W.	Social Work

Computer Center, University of Maine, Orono

Russell Altenberger, M.A.	Statistics
Gerald Dube, B.S.	Statistics & Programming
Gary Norton	Computer Programmer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword v
Preface vii
Acknowledgements x

INTRODUCTIONS 1
  Background Information on the Project 1
  Statement of the Problem 2
  Setting in Which the Research Was Done 4
    The Institution and the Field 4
    The State of Maine 5
  Review of the Relevant Literature 7

METHODOLOGY 13
  Population and Sample 13
  Variables and Hypotheses 14
  Data Collection and Analysis 18
    Data Collection 18
    Analysis 20
    Statistics 22

RESULTS 24
  Use of the Statistical Tables 24
  Details of the Statistical Analyses 26
  Results of the Statistical Analyses 27
    Legal Behavior 27
    Self Support 27
    Wage Levels 28
    Personal Domiciles 31
    Marital Status 32
  Descriptive Results 33

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION OF RESULTS 35
  Significance of the Results 35
  Problems Encountered 37
  Implications for Theory and Practice 39
  Significance for Use in the Field 42

SUMMARY 45

REFERENCES 48

APPENDICES 50
  A. Table of Regressions and Significant Variables 50
  B. Index to Appendix B 53
    Multilinear Regressions and Discrim. Functions 54
  C. Coding for Significant Variables 102

NOTE: Accompanying this report and separately bound are: ✓

TABULAR SUPPLEMENT   BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

FOREWORD

The report by Dr. Peter W. Bowman and Dr. John L. Hoffman is a study of a large group (569) of mentally retarded men and women who were previously institutionalized at the Pineland Hospital and Training Center. Most of them spent a major portion of their developmental years at Pineland, where they were educated, trained vocationally, and prepared for independent living outside the hospital. As they approached adulthood and grew in competence, they were discharged from Pineland during the nine-year period from 1952-1961, and since that time have been living in their home communities throughout Maine. You may well surmise that during their younger years this group of retarded persons and also their families underwent some stressful, perhaps unfortunate experiences. We would like to think that their years at Pineland were more fortunate and that the educational and rehabilitation programs provided to them truly helped them to lead productive lives and develop happier and more satisfying personal relationships.

The purpose of this volume is to answer some persistent questions in the minds of special educators, of administrators of hospitals and rehabilitation programs, of legislators who make provision for such programs, and in the minds of many individuals in public and private life who are genuinely concerned about the welfare of people handicapped by mental retardation. The questions are: "What happens to previously institutionalized mentally retarded persons?" "What problems do they encounter, and how do they solve them?" "What solutions are available to them?" "Have we, in our institutions, provided appropriate training, in appropriate amounts and at the appropriate time?" "What needs to be done outside institutions to facilitate the progress of retarded persons towards independent living and constructive participation in society?" The answers to these questions and many others are presented in the findings of this stimulating research conducted at the Pineland Hospital and Training Center by Dr. Bowman, Dr. Hoffman and their colleagues. We commend this scholarly work to the attention of administrators of health, education, social and rehabilitation programs to take from it what is most useful in their continuing efforts to assist the large number of people disadvantaged by mental retardation.

Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senator

PREFACE

For those familiar with the syndrome of mental retardation and its social, economic and emotional aspects, it is probably an unnecessary understatement to state that there have been considerable changes of philosophy and practice in the last 20 years.

Although it is equally well-known that these changes have not reached all areas, and, in some instances, all efforts have been persistently defied, we would nevertheless like to place the subject matter of this research in the developmental context of such changes since in our study changes have been fundamental and pervasive.

The contrasts between the early and later parts of this relatively brief period have been more sharply defined by Dr. Hoffman and myself and our associates:

When I was appointed superintendent of Pineland Hospital and Training Center (then Pownal State School) in 1953, I was rudely introduced to an institution that was, in many ways, a typical exhibition case of the worst practices prevailing in the days of the older philosophies of custodial "care" for the "feeble minded".

Patients were forced to work up to 16 hours a day, 7 days a week, without any form of remuneration. They, in fact, occupied places of responsibility as assistant attendants, washmen, food service workers, cleaning women. Their employment was one of involuntary servitude in fact. They drank unpasteurized milk. Preventive health services such as tuberculosis case finding and treatment were completely neglected. The raw sewerage of the institution ran downhill in an open ditch. One unlicensed physician attempted to take care of 1450 patients. There was no facility for blood or urine tests. There was no organized provision for an aftercare and placement program outside the institution, and the "inmates" voiced their conviction that there was "no way out of this place except in a pine box".

The institution was sexually segregated in every conceivable activity from attending school to social dances, and the patients were treated in an atmosphere that one would expect to find in a more poorly run correctional institution.

The patients covered in our study were those discharged from late 1952 up to early 1961. This was a period when many changes were planned, initiated or executed both at the institutional level as well as in the communities throughout the State, allowing the realizations of new directions and purposes.

Hundreds of patients who previously had been condemned without real reason to a lifetime of custodial confinement and deprivation here, based on work training experience, were discharged to useful and rewarding lives of self-support and various degrees of independence.

Other younger patients were enabled to return to the community and profit from newly established special classes for the educables at first and later on the trainables. The latter program in the State of Maine is one of the most significant and exciting changes that were brought about by a large number of knowledgeable and motivated people working together and achieving somewhat unique success.

A beginning was also made for boarding home, nursing home, and placements for the elderly or otherwise seriously disabled patients under the Old Age Assistance and Aid to the Disabled payments. The latter program, however, climaxed only in recent years.

The combined programs have resulted in a decrease of population at this hospital by some 48% over the past 15 years.

In general, Pineland Hospital and Training Center, in the mid-50's, underwent a complete change of direction by assembling a diversity of highly skilled and specialized professions and disciplines, all with definite relevance to the amelioration, cure, or improvement of a variety of problems presented by people with retardation syndromes.

Its basic aim was to return to the community in whatever type of placement was most suitable once the rehabilitation process had been brought to its optimal potential, and a new patient to be admitted in his place. This, of course, does not include those individuals whose disability is so complex and involved that placement anywhere else would not be feasible.

This process was accompanied by the establishment of medical-surgical services, reorganization of the nursing service, establishment of a physical therapy department that became affiliated with the University of Connecticut, initiation of a dental program, establishment of a neurological laboratory, and a medical photography service, reorganization of the pharmacy, staff appointments to supervise a department of roentgenology, establishment of a laboratory of anatomic and clinical pathology as well as biochemistry. A corps of 17 social workers replaced the "custodial social worker" whose sole duty had been to purchase small merchandise for those who were lucky enough to have some money.* A department of occupational therapy was established and staffed. Under the Hospital Improvement Program a most modern speech and hearing clinic, with competent staff, was planned, executed and added to the program.

A volunteer service has brought numerous benefits to countless patients. Instead of hopelessly trying to cope with the records of 350 patients, back in 1953, who had not as yet been diagnosed although they had resided for 2 or 3 years at the hospital, our medical records division now has detailed, up-to-date, and inclusive information available on each and every patient.

Recently this hospital became the first place in Maine where domiciliary vocational rehabilitation takes place in conjunction with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the State of Maine.

Because of our conviction that services to children with developmental problems should not be fragmented and because of our awareness that a fair number of patients with the mental retardation syndrome also have concomitant psychiatric problems, a children's psychiatric hospital at Pineland Hospital and Training Center was conceived, designed, constructed and put into operation by November of 1961.

A summer day camp at Lower Range Pond, a newly constructed gymnasium, bowling alleys, and an All Faith's Chapel are contributing immeasurably to humanize patient care and treatment and attitudinal approaches by staff and community.

One of the most significant achievements took place in 1969 when the Legislature of the State of Maine passed the basic ingredients to a meaningful guardianship act for the mentally retarded to provide eventually for truly protective services in this area.

---

* The "custodial" social worker aptly adapted to the new program and is still a member of the staff.

A sheltered workshop has been in operation on the grounds of the institution, and a "hostel" designed to provide residential community living to employed men and women at the trainable level is nearing realization.

All these achievements are the result of collective, informed judgment of, and consistent forceful efforts by, a dedicated staff that by now includes several "professional generations".

While I conceived the idea of this study, the exclusive credit for its formulation and execution goes to John L. Hoffman. His inventive mind, his perceptive abilities and his intellectual integrity and brilliance produced a significant design, the results of which are presented in the three following volumes.

Peter W. Bowman, M.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is owing first and last to Pineland Hospital and Training Center for its support of this work. Following Dr. Peter W. Bowman's arrival as Pineland's Director in 1953, there have been and continue to be at this institution a wide number of progressive developments. Among these has been a climate highly favorable to research, and this has produced a number of projects, studies, reports, journal articles in bio-medical, psychological, educational, and other fields. It was this climate that gave rise to this project in its earliest stages, and that encouraged and supported it through its development and conclusion.

To the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare thanks are due for their generous funding which permitted our research to be conducted on an expanded scale, and made possible the use of powerful computers and related data processing equipment in its analysis.

This relatively large scale study was accomplished not abruptly with a slightly disoriented throng, but over a somewhat longer period of time with a relatively small and unified staff. Accordingly, the individual contributions to the project of these dedicated staff members have been very considerable and the recognition due to them is commensurate.

Dorothy Jones has been with the project almost from its beginning. As skilled operator of desk computer, calculator, IBM card sorter, key punch, and typewriter, she has been a mainstay in our work, contributing literally thousands of hours of unflagging and zealous effort, and expertly processing a great quantity and variety of data.

Our social worker interviewers, in order of their length of time with the project, were Lucille Dwinal, Barbara Britten, Hildegarde Ayer, and Kathleen Casey.

As tracers of missing persons, Miss Dwinal and Miss Britten traveled not only to remote corners of our own state of Maine but to the other New England states as well, as far south as Connecticut, to collect the basic data on our dischargees. Their routes were the crowded turnpikes and the rough byroads, and their province included fashionable suburbs, farms, city apartments, crumbling urban slums, and rural tarpaper shacks, in a resolute itinerary that along with other sources was to obtain information on all but 9 of the 569 dischargees.

Subsequently, Miss Dwinal and Miss Ayer provided an added and significant dimension of biographies and in-depth interviews, tape-recorded, with selected dischargees. Mrs. Casey covered areas of finances and money management in a series of follow-up visits to certain dischargees.

To a variety of always challenging and sometimes very trying circumstances, all of the interviewers brought an unusual degree of empathy, insight, and rapport that encouraged easy communication and made for polychrome illumination of the formal statistics of the study.

To our friends Russell Altenberger, Gerald Dube, and Gary Norton of the Computing Center at the University of Maine in Orono is owed our gratitude for their valuable statistical advice, kind forebearance with the vagaries of social science, and skilled guidance and programming of our data through the complexities of the IBM 360 Computer.

A wide selection of State Agencies, Departments, Bureaus and Divisions,

and many city and town officials all served to provide necessary and vital information on multiple aspects of the lives of our dischargees, formally verifying the occurrence and -- equally important -- the non-occurrence of various types of behavior resulting in, for example, police contacts, receipt of welfare, inadequate self-support, etc.

Among the many so involved, the following are particularly deserving of mention along with the presiding officials at the time when the information was obtained. The State's Department of Health and Welfare was especially helpful, and assisting divisions under this department included: the Division of Office Services, with Francis E. Crocker as Director, this service incorporating the Social Service Index; the Division of Research and Vital Statistics with Edson K. Labrack as Director; under the Bureau of Social Welfare, whose Director was Stephen P. Simonds, were the Division of Child Welfare with Edgar J. Merrill as Director, the Division of Family Services with Pauline A. Smith as Director, and the Division of General Assistance with Paul D. McClay as Director, and in addition, the personnel of this Bureau's branch offices throughout the state. Of similar importance were the Maine State Police, with Captain J. Edward Marks as Director of the Criminal Division, and Lieutenant Guy Bacheller who was succeeded by Lieutenant Emery R. Jordan as Commanding Officer of the State Bureau of Identification in that department.

Under our own Department of Mental Health and Corrections, units providing information were Augusta State Hospital with John C. Patterson, M.D., Superintendent, the Bangor State Hospital with the late Harold A. Pooler, M.D., as Superintendent, the Women's Reformatory at Skowhegan which is fortunate in having as its Superintendent Miss Ward E. Murphy, the Men's Reformatory at South Windham with Merton R. Johnson as Superintendent, and Maine State Prison at Thomaston with Allen L. Robbins as Warden and Donald B. Chase as Classification Officer; and in addition, there was the Division of Probation and Parole also of our parent department.

Assistance was received from other agencies, such as city welfare departments, and from such town officials as selectmen and those most admirable, knowledgeable, and informative of all public officials, Town Clerks, who also were extremely helpful in the location of subjects.

Sources similar to the above, but in other states also supplied information on our out-of-state dischargees.

In the early stages of the project, valuable counsel and advice was received from Dr. Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, Chairman of the Sociology Department at Connecticut College.

In the pilot stage, and later as well, a wealth of background material and personal information about our dischargees was kindly provided from the encyclopedic memory of Mrs. Josephine Goodwin, associated for many years with Pineland's Social Service Department. Many departments and individuals as well at Pineland were helpful, including the Medical Records Department, Department of Education and Training, the Psychology Department, and others.

Many who were in one way or another helpful to our project have not been mentioned. To list all these, and to render really adequate thanks to them and to those already cited, is unfortunately not possible in the limited scope of this report. Without the many types of generous assistance from all of these agencies, institutions, officials, and individuals, this study could not have been undertaken and completed.

John L. Hoffman, Ph. D.

ABSTRACT

Information from many sources was obtained about 560 retardates located some 4 to 10 years after institutional discharge. A large qualified subgroup was chosen for predictive analysis. Hypothesis: post-discharge successful behavior should not be given an overall gross score but should be differentiated into distinct types for separate analyses. Major behavior categories used (with dichotomized opposites) were: absence of police contacts, full self support, higher wage levels, and personal domiciliary stability. Through multilinear regression analysis, significant longitudinal pre-discharge independent variables were selected, and used with discriminant function analysis to identify and thus predict the several types of post-discharge behavior, with about 75% effectiveness. Quite different variables identified these different types of behavior. Formulae are provided to permit replication of prediction of probable behaviors for similar populations, for use in various types of long range planning.

A Tabular Supplement gives detailed longitudinal descriptive statistics on many aspects of subjects' lives from birth to time of post-discharge follow up. A Biographical Supplement gives illustrative examples of many levels and types of post-discharge adjustment. These supplements aim to provide a better understanding of this unique population marked by many past traumatic life experiences.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

In the larger sense, this research project was the product of self examination on the part of newer and more humane philosophies toward retardation, and the expression of these philosophies in actual treatment of the retarded.

Maine, along with other states, had gone through a period of exposure to belief in ironclad custodiality for this group. Our institution, originally founded as The Maine School for the Feeble-Minded, had in its earlier years as its mission the impounding of as many of the state's retarded as possible behind custodial brick walls. This crusade was based on the then current belief that the retarded were the major cause of most crimes and social ills, that they were breeding at an unconscionable rate, and that because of them organized and decent society was soon to founder in total ruin. And genealogical studies of derelict families and bloodlines had "proven" that feeblemindedness (which could be, curiously, not only mental, but moral and economic as well) was inevitably inherited by offspring of one or two feeble-minded parents.

Our institution of the past argued its case only too well, and feeblemindedness became all too often a synonym for menace. Too, in a period in Maine of rural poverty and depopulation, and of urban economic difficulties, it was perhaps convenient to have easily identified scapegoats. It was assuredly convenient for local overseers of the town poor throughout the state to have a dumping ground, fully pre-rationalized, for the children of indigent families; thus they could be removed as town expenses and placed "on the state." Other agencies and officials as well were not above using the institution in this manner.

Many injustices were committed in sending to the institution children who were not really retarded or whose conditions were remediable, and further injustices were done in keeping them and others at the institution for, literally, decades, with totally inadequate treatment.

With the arrival at the institution in 1953 of a new superintendent attuned to modern beliefs and practices regarding retardation, there were new policies against custodiality and for discharge of patients -- discharge which in some years was to run more than 500% above the previous cautious custodial rate of only 20 or 25 patients per year. The menacing hordes that the Maine School for the Feeble-Minded had so ardently impounded were now being turned loose in society, and some public repercussions of alarm were only to be expected.

There was ample empirical evidence of the good qualities of the dischargees, and proof of their good or satisfactory behavior up to the time of discharge. There was no rational justification to support a belief that 50 patients should be imprisoned for life in the institution because an unidentified 5 of their number might be involved in minor violations of the law.

However, it seemed desirable and important to find out just what had eventually happened to these dischargees and how they had fared. This inquiry was less to answer waning objections to their discharge than to answer a number of our own questions, theoretical and practical, on policies and practices, on the differential performance of the dischargees in a variety of social situations, and on a number of related matters as well.

Toward supplying answers to some of these questions, a preliminary inquiry was begun on a sample of some 60 of the dischargees who had left the institution in the years 1952 through 1958.

On the basis of findings regarding this group and our projected research interests, an application for wider research support made to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration was favorably received and a grant allocation of some $134,000 made to permit a wider, and more detailed study of our dischargee population. The beginning of federal support for the project was July 1, 1964.

All patients who had been discharged from July 1, 1952 to June 30, 1961, were included in this expanded coverage. The project began or continued with this phase of dischargee location, data collection and verification, and recording and coding. This coverage included not only the unadorned although quite extensive factual and statistical data about the dischargees, but more personal material, interview sketches or vignettes, selected brief autobiographies, and tape recorded autobiographical accounts. Data collection, coding, and card punching were followed by analytical stages, computer analysis (the most complex of this occurring in the final year of the project), and the writing up of the final report.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Increasing emphasis is being placed nowadays in restoring the retarded to the community and in maintaining them there in economically and socially significant activities. Because of the provision of special classes in public schools, drastic changes in policies of institutions for the retarded, and the new availability of various kinds of support, lengthy institutional custodiality is becoming increasingly a thing of the past.

But with the warming of the humanitarian climate there have come other changes as well. The past bases for actual employment, supervision, and support in the community have been altered. The extended family network for instance has largely passed from the scene, leaving only the nuclear family, where the incapacity or death of parents necessarily has far-reaching effects on the fate of a retarded child.

The old widespread agricultural economy has largely disappeared too, along with the family farmstead and rural life where the retarded had always been to some extent useful in carrying out the simpler or simplest tasks, and where social demands made on them were not excessive.

Indeed, in all phases of our economy increasing mechanization and automtion have made steady inroads on the number of semi-skilled and unskilled jobs and kinds of work that were formerly available.

Thus, along with this newer emphasis on restoring the retarded to the community, there have occurred separately but simultaneously the decrease and loss of former types of placements and employment suitable for this group, creating in this whole area many new problems.

Professional agencies are turned to more and more for remedial solutions to such problems. Institutions discharging retarded patients when there is need for special vocational training or guidance for readjustment, various community agencies concerned with the retarded already living in the wider society, and the retardates' parents themselves -- all are searching for both direction and education that will lead positively toward some kind of meaningful self support.

Evaluation of the potentials of students and trainees among the retarded becomes of importance and concern. Various tests may indicate an individual's capacity to undertake certain training, or may even suggest his chances of being hired at the conclusion of a training period. But these tests tend to be short-ranged, predictively, and they say little or nothing about an individual's overall capacity, once he is hired, to make maximum use of his training and to remain employed over a long range period.

It is therefore important to know as fully as possible which individuals will, over an extended period, profit most from educational and training programs as they are now constituted. Specifically, it should be asked which ones will move to the better or higher side of wage ranges, which ones will be free of hampering entanglements with the police and correctional agencies, which ones can maintain stable and mutually supporting social networks, and which will be least likely to sink to dependency levels with support by welfare or other agencies, institutions, and persons. If the training as now constituted is not used in a long range manner, it has been given in vain, the money wasted, and perhaps a better qualified individual neglected.

The field of minimal performance, breakdown, and failure is in itself another problem area of interest for the information it can provide toward the development of educational and rehabilitative techniques. Once non-successful individuals are identified as to the above described subtypes of poor performance, and their delimiting contingencies described, there must be raised the question of their specific prior etiologies and symptomatologies in the institutional and formative pre-institutional periods. With an understanding of the inter-related elements of these three life periods, it then becomes possible to suggest guidelines for new, unique, or specially adapted techniques for remedial action.

Related is a more generalized problem area of concern which has to do with the understanding and knowledge of the specialized nature of the population involved. This population of institutional dischargees is one that has been written about far more than it has been described. Weighted rather heavily with cases in the true mental retardation sub-category of mental subnormality (in the Sarason and Gladwin terminology), this population is one considerably associated with lower class background and, often, ethnic minority position.

The other subcategory, mental deficiency, has by and large received more attention within recent years. Interested middle class and professional parent groups have organized to promote various programs, including research on physical etiologies and preventive measures. Retardation that is culturally or socially caused has failed to recruit as much central organization and pressure toward investigation and analysis.

The special group of institutional dischargees constitutes a breed in itself. Recruited quite largely from low or lowest class background, its members have usually undergone traumata which can include exposure to psychically unhealthy parents or surrogates, overt rejection of various sorts and/or the impact of multiple changes in the adult structure of the nuclear family or pseudofamily (parental deaths, desertions, etc., foster home placements, orphanage histories, and so on). With the development thus slowed, halted, or distorted on many fronts, they eventually become fully eligible candidates for institutional treatment. This latter experience of institutionalization in itself has been in the fairly recent past not without trauma, stigma, and the ingrained effects of "institutionalization." After varying periods of time these subjects are reintroduced in various ways into a society that can even today still be characterized by indifference or antipathy. This group, although known and understood by a certain number of directly concerned persons, has seldom been fully or even adequately described in the entirety of its tripartite career.

Accordingly, those in specifically rehabilitative agencies (as well as others who have professional contact with this discharge group) whose main experience and disciplinary background have been concerned with fairly "normal" persons, are without any frankly ethnographic description of this specialized and curiously different population.

There is finally, another problem area, that of directed social change. When the limits of what special training can accomplish and of what remedial treatment can achieve are reached -- and where dreary life-custodiality behind brick walls seems assuredly not to be the answer -- other questions must necessarily be raised. These are concerned with knowing more fully the requirements of those who have been in one way or another reintegrated into the larger society. Beyond a superfluous "does well" or "does poorly", just what are the specific problems, hazards, and failures that are most frequently experienced by the retarded living in society? In what ways do present formal and legal roles and statuses provided for the mentally subnormal fail to meet their true needs and capacities, either through requiring too little or too much from them? In what ways do relevant and concerned agencies and services fail to provide adequate support, guidance, and perhaps even controls for this population?

Provided with information from detailed investigation and analysis of such difficulties, these agencies and services may then work toward a new phraseology of the place of the retarded in society and of agency responsibility toward them.

SETTING IN WHICH THE RESEARCH WAS DONE

The Institution and the Field

The central setting in which the research was conducted is Pineland Hospital and Training Center in Pownal, Maine. This is the State of Maine's facility for the education, training, and care of the retarded. Founded in 1908 as the Maine School for the Feeble-Minded, it was later renamed the Pownal State School. The current Pineland complex includes not only the present advanced facilities for the retarded but a Children's Psychiatric Hospital, and the new Bliss Vocational Rehabilitation Center.

Fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals since 1963, Pineland has since the 1950's seen the development of many modern medical and paramedical services for the retarded along with its total shift in emphasis from earlier custodiality to positive programs for diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Medical Services include a regular staff of physicians, regularly held special clinics with consultant specialists, the pharmacy, a large nursing staff, Physical Therapy Department, a full time dentist, electroencephalograph and related equipment and technician, an X-Ray room and technician. The subdivisions of the Department of Pathology are bacteriology, chemistry, cytogenics, hematology, and histology. The Paramedical Services include departments of Social Service, Medical Records, Volunteer Services, Chaplains, Personnel, Occupational Therapy, Speech and Hearing, with the Department of Training incorporating academic education, vocational training, work training programs, and Physical Education and Recreation. Psychiatric Services include those provided by the staff psychiatrists and the department of psychology. Outpatient services are provided by the Child Guidance Clinic, Genetic Counseling Clinic, Speech and Hearing Services, and Outpatient Evaluation Service.

The more complex statistical work for this project was accomplished at the Computer Center at the University of Maine in Orono. The Center's earlier equipment included an IBM 1620 Computer, and more recently the IBM 360-30 Computer being phased to the 360-40. Ancillary data processing equipment is of course also a component of the Center.

However, to say that the research was accomplished only at these locations and during the cited duration would not be correct. Because of the longitudinal nature of the study and its reliance on retained medical records, our pre-discharge time dimension goes as far back as 1908, the inception of the institution -- when its first patient and first superintendent arrived from Massachusetts. Among our dischargees in this study, indeed, was this same Number One Patient. Originally from Maine, he had been farmed out to the Massachusetts School for the Feeble-Minded (now the Walter E. Fernald School) and returning to Maine, acted as houseman for 5 generations of superintendents at Pownal. Preadmission and other data in these earlier case histories ranges well back into the Nineteenth Century.

Geographically, our post-discharge coverage ranged far afield from the institution. Follow up interviews and other collection of data took place throughout our own state of Maine, which is equal in area to the other 5 New England states combined. Such coverage within the state ranged from our Southwestern corner to "Way Down East" in the Eastport, Lubec and Jonesport areas, to the north and into Aroostook County -- whose northernmost towns, Van Buren, Madawaska, and Fort Kent, are further in air and road miles from our institution than is New York City.

In addition, follow up interview visits were also conducted in New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. Coverage of dischargees who had ventured beyond these states -- and a number did -- was managed by means of letters and questionnaires, correspondence with various authorities, and through the use of the in-state informant -- most often a relative of the out of state dischargee. Post-discharge states of residence were as distant as Florida, Colorado, the Dakotas, and California.

The State of Maine

Maine with its 33,215 square miles, although only 36th in size among the other states, is as noted, equal in area to the other New England states together. Maine's coast line of 250 air miles incorporates a convoluted 2,379 miles of actual shore line. This spectacularly scenic coastline, the unspoiled forests, lakes and inland waterways still offer respite to those weary of areas despoiled by man's social and industrial excretions, populous centers of civilization where the macerated land festers beneath a universal exzema of factories and crackerbox housing, and where seeds, eggs, and foetuses shrivel and die from the accumulated impurities of air, earth, water, food, and blood.

Demographically, almost two-thirds of Maine's 1965 estimated population of 993,000 live in towns of less than 10,000. The largest urban complex of Portland, South Portland, and Westbrook comprises some 112,174 persons. Lewiston and Auburn include some 65,253 persons in their urban unit, while the joint population of Biddeford and Saco is 29,770. On an individual basis, only one city, Portland, is in the 70,000 - 80,000 range. One, Lewiston, is in the 40,000 - 50,000 range. And one, Bangor, is in the 30 - 40,000 range. Three are in the 20 - 30,000 bracket. Twelve towns are in the 10 - 20,000 range, and all the rest are smaller. At the far end of the scale are the unorganized townships, with populations as low as half a dozen or less, and beyond these are the unorganized townships that have become entirely depopulated.

The state's period of most rapid growth was between 1810 and 1870, when the numbers rose from 228,705 to 626,915 - an increase of 174%. From the 1870 level, the population had increased by 1960 to 969,265 - an increase of only 55%. While certain urban and suburban areas in the state are increasing, certain rural ones are still depopulating. One has the subjective architectural impression that by 1870 many remote or smaller towns had put up their Civil War Statues on the green (all from a single supplier), stopped their church clocks, and drifted off into a century long sleep.

Eighty-seven percent of Maine is forested, and the wood products industry presently employs some 27% of the state's wage earners. The next largest manufacturing categories are shoes and textiles. While the annual value of wood products is $585,000,000, tourism brings in an estimated $300,000,000, and Maine license plates bear the legend "Vacationland." Farming, with its largest single category of poultry and eggs (the pandemic chicken farm), follows tourism with $290,000,000 per year. Maine supplies 75% of all U.S.A. lobsters, 30% of soft shell clams, 15% of U.S.A. potatoes (second to Idaho), and 90% of lowbush blueberries.

The commercial shipbuilding and shipping industry of the more prosperous 19th Century has largely disappeared from the Maine coast, the fishing industry has fallen onto bleak days, and the mills and textile industry have scarcely held their own in the face of foreign competition and southward migration. Further, the old farmstead economy, perhaps never too viable with such a short growing season, has ground to a virtual halt. In Maine, the winters come early and stay late. Seven other states, excluding Alaska, had colder average temperatures, but only three reported colder record temperatures. There is a very real struggle against the elements, with time out for the steady snows or sweeping blizzards, and more time to open the transportation arteries afterwards, all of which consumes energy and money and interrups other activities. Somewhat mysteriously, Maine's roads are always better cleared of snow and ice than those of prosperous Massachusetts.

Located in the northeasternmost corner of the country, Maine must cope with being geographically and therefore commercially marginal. While so, it is near enough to financially more rewarding areas, such as Massachusetts and Connecticut, to be subject to emigration of the young, the trained, and the educated in some numbers. This movement undoubtedly makes for a drain on the state's energies and human resources. Relatively low wage scales do not tend to tempt many persons into Maine from other states. As of 1965, only 12 states had per capita annual incomes lower than Maine's $2,277. Westward, the nearest of these is South Dakota, and southward the nearest is West Virginia. Appalachia and the deep south claim most of the poorer states.

It may be wondered why the lagging economy, depressed wage levels, and long winters have not sent all of the state's population fleeing southward to the greener suburban pastures of sweet affluence.

Other, positive factors are of course at work for Maine. The most overt and identified imperfections of high civilization are the crowds and crowded living conditions, traffic, crime, the high cost of living, and political corruption. Maine residents see themselves as escaping these evils.

In addition, other less obvious virtues and rewards, more widespread in 19th Century America, are still extant in Maine. Sociologically, Maine is pervaded still by a largely gemeinschaft or multibonded ethos that affects both individual and community. This ethos is created of course by long range residence in smaller, more intimate communities, where members relate to one another in many different formal and informal roles (e.g., the clerk in a store where you shop may be to you simultaneously your cousin, a neighbor, a fellow parishioner, and a member of a secular organization to which you belong.)

This multibonded quality is preserved by the state's rather marginal location with social and other "marginal survivals," by the slower economy which preserves a status quo, by the predominance of emigration over immigration, and by the high proportion of small towns rather widely separated from one another.

This rather widely pervading ethos and pattern for organization have a number of effects. An individual sense of identity, both positive and favorable, is provided and sustained -- and with this a sense of security regarding both self and community. Maine does not produce those faceless and rootless crowds that with inarticulate and generalized rage indiscriminately destroy flags, automobiles, computers, shopping centers, and libraries. Indeed, the entire state seems to have more sense of regional identity and positive social unity than do many cities elsewhere with as many people as Maine in an area only a minute fraction of Maine's size.

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

In the limited space of this report, it is not possible to present a detailed critical examination of the relevant literature. Nor is it necessary to do so, as two excellent surveys already exist. For a review and discussion of wider and more general coverage of research on mental subnormality, there is the outstanding and now classic report by Sarason and Gladwin (1958). For more specific coverage of research on prognosis of mental subnormals in a number of different areas, there is the thoughtful and inclusive review by Windle (1961). In this, the achievements, generalizations, contradictions, problems, methodology, and shortcomings in the field are analytically surveyed and discussed, and certain guidelines are suggested for future research, along with recommendations for greater statistical sophistication.

A still more limited field, covered in part by Windle's study, is that of follow-up research on subnormals formerly in special classes, special schools, and institutions. Some brief notes on some of the studies in this field are given below.

Earlier or pioneering studies in the field of social performance of the retarded along with realistic appraisal of such performance occurred as a reaction to the iron-bound and absolute genetic determinism of an earlier period of the Jukes and Kallikaks type of studies. For example, the original study by M.R. Baller (1936) of subjects formerly classified as mentally deficient when in elementary schools, gave an optimistic view of the social adjustment of most of the group of 206 subjects. The follow-up study some 15 years later of this same group by D.C. Charles (1953) reinforced Baller's conclusions and revealed that with maturity the subjects had been able to profit from improved economic conditions, had become more self-sufficient, and had not produced numerous feeble-minded offspring.

A study by Reynolds and MacEachern (1956) investigates static or biographical factors related to post-discharge outcome of 340 subjects from the Owatonna State Training School. The criterion for success is living in the community, that for failure is institutionalization. Although certain tendencies appeared in these factors, higher IQ alone was significantly related to "success". Of a second group of 117 later dischargees, it was found that a family record of mental deficiency and also prior multiple home situations were related positively to successful outcome.

An exhaustive monograph by Reynolds and Stunkard (1960) represents in part a continuation of the study and analysis of the same (Owatonna) discharged population, now increased to 500 (with 91 of these "lost"). Here the investigators moved into an area of true attempted statistical prediction of outcome. Using a combination of "static" factors and/or "dynamic" pre-discharge factors, they relate these predictively to outcome of "success" (living in community) and "failure" (in institution). These factors are variously weighted and combined so as to form various predictive instruments, and serve to pre-identify the criterion groups at a significant degree approaching a level of 50% better than chance.

Students at the Owatonna School cannot continue there past the age of 21. It is not clear from the text what happens at the point when staff at the school considers subjects who are ready for discharge. If staff decision at this point routes the subjects either to custodial institutions or to community placements, then the investigators are predicting staff decisions rather than the subsequent results of in-community trials. In these studies, the instruments used did not seem to distinguish predictively between more finely separated groups, such as the "well" and "poorly" adjusted individuals in the community. In its own right however this work discriminates significantly between certain broad categories of outcome, and marks a step forward in its use of more sophisticated and truly predictive statistics.

C.H. Krishef's studies (1959), and with co-authors (1959), deal with the same discharged population and use similar outcome criteria. A variety of variables were tested and found, individually, not significant. In the first study, however, higher admission IQ, and higher age of admission, along with higher age of discharge, as found by Reynolds, were in part positively related to subsequent non-institutionalization. In the second study, no pre-discharge factors seemed to distinguish significantly in general between good and poor adjustment of those actually in the community, while higher IQ was found inversely related to favorable staff ratings of adjustment of those within institutions. While establishing significant relationships, these studies do not attempt actual prediction.

A.J. Shafter's study of 205 subjects from the Woodward State Hospital and School in Iowa stresses dynamic factors (1956) (1957). He tested out some 66 characteristics, and derived from these twelve which were found significantly related to discharge on vocational placement. While pointing out the need to study the sexes separately, Shafter saw in respect to this particular study static factors as not significant. A number of these, some rather generally defined, were tested. The criterion for success was discharge from a vocational placement, that for failure was return to the institution from vocational placement because of a fault of the patient. With his twelve significant dynamic factors, Shafter was able to develop gross behavior scores. These were found, through an analysis of variance, to differentiate significantly between successful and unsuccessful placements, with F equal 32.29 at the 5% level. The gross behavior scores were converted to sigma scores and "actuarial" chances in 100 of a successful placement. A Simon-pure top-scorer had 66 chances in 100 of success, whereas a worst-scorer had 29 chances in 100.

It is possible that Shafter's methodological procedures affected the apparent strength of his relationships. A subject returned to institution for his own fault was not considered again in the sample; apparently "successful" subjects in this sample could have experienced vocational placement failure prior to the time of their study. As with many studies, the relationships are those between rather closely situated variables and criteria. The criteria came crowding on the heels of the variables, as it were. Many other factors are of course involved, and these questions are raised to suggest the complexity of the problems rather than to deprecate the intelligence and integrity of the investigator. Shafter himself recognizes the need for replicative study of his predictive device in other settings, and is well aware of the present very speculative state of research in this entire area.

R.J.R. Kennedy's studies concerning the educable retarded are well known. The more recent one (1962) incorporates and gives a longitudinal dimension to the first, pioneering study The Social Adjustment of Morons in a Connecticut City. This research compares two groups. The first group is of 256 Subjects identified as being in the "educable" range (IQ's 50-75) who had been special class students in Middletown, Connecticut. The second group is a 50% sample of 129 Controls, carefully and equally matched with Subjects with the exception of Controls' IQ's and school performance being in the normal range and unretarded. Although etiologies are not detailed, the rather high percent of foreign ethnic background (e.g., 73.5% Italian and Polish) suggests some kind of cultural involvement and difficulties in adapting to American ways of life. Examination and comparison of the two groups is exactingly made in a great many aspects of a broad front of personal, social and economic performance. The investigator's general conclusion is that "the overwhelming majority of both Subjects and Controls have made acceptable and remarkably similar adjustment in all three areas." Study in 1960 of the school performance of children of Subjects and Controls is of interest in revealing the advancement toward normal performance on the part of Subjects' children.

While not specifically predictive in nature, this study is somewhat generically allied in its type of hypothesis testing, disproving Juke-Kallikak absolutism. It also consciously points up and supports the Sarason and Gladwin assertion that "In the case of the mentally retarded, most of whom maintain themselves in the community, there is strong evidence that our conventional tests leave much to be desired both as evaluators or predictors." Certainly this study too shows the continuing value of providing a good, detailed multifaceted description of a particular population. Until something of the natural history of a population is known, it is certainly premature to attempt to limn predictive relationships between hypotheticals.

N. O'Connor and J. Tizard investigated the prediction of social workers' estimates of work success or employability of 104 institutional high grade mentally subnormal males (1951) (1956). A variety of personality, locomotor, intelligence and aptitude tests were given to the subjects. Optimally weighted, the most significant variables were combined to provide an overall multiple correlation of .67 with positive ratings of employability. The combination of significant variables culled from a rather wide variety of test types and appropriately weighted to form an overall instrument is of interest here. However, the criteria used were ones of social worker estimates of future employability rather than a more objective type of actual achievement.

A study by O.P. Kolstoe (1961) concerns itself with the criterion of actually obtained employment (rather than an opinion of employability). Eighty-two male subjects described as retarded were involved, and they had been accepted as clients in an Employment Evaluation and Training Project. Following a period of evaluation and fifteen weeks of diverse employment training experience, 41 of the subjects were able to obtain employment while 41 others could not. The subjects were scored on a variety of factors as variables to be tested. Described as Status Factors were those subsumed by home influence, age, sibling rank in family, IQ, physical appearance and condition, years of school and academic achievement, and rural vs. urban background. Under Dynamic Factors are personality and work habits. Total results are too complex to describe here, but in a general way the rather generally stated standard "status" factors were found either quite unclear in their effects or perhaps without significant effects.

Kolstoe felt the need for factor analysis to delineate particularly suitable sub-elements of personality. In addition, a more detailed analysis of home backgrounds (whether and how supporting or not) was felt necessary. The need to interrelate specific capacities to specific intellectual, personal, social and vocational skills required by particular jobs is stressed by Kolstoe and Shafter (1961) in a later article, who see this as an area for research.

Windle, Steward, and Brown (1961) stress the need to treat differing types of patients and leave situations separately because of the very considerable difference of the situation dynamics involved. Study was made of one group on vocational leave, of one on home leave, and of one on family care. Of those that failed within a four year period and were subsequently reinstitutionalized, large differences were found as to actual causes of reinstitutionalization, depending upon the leave type. The authors deprecatingly state, "Because no measure of either the reliability or meaningfulness of the classes has been obtained, these data must be regarded as merely suggestive."

However, there would seem to be much value and potentiality in the general methodological principle of treating generic types of situations separately, of carefullydelimiting the sub-areas of analysis, rather than jumbling many types and descriptions together to get the standard deviation of hash.

Goroff (1967) provides valuable insight into a somewhat related area, pointing out the rather wide discrepancies between professional and lay value systems as these affect the appraisal of in-community crisis situations and the resulting return or non-return of retardates to the institution.

A study by Jackson and Butler (1963) rating subjects on a conglomerate of sums of rating scales of several sorts, examines predictively two groups: those who had gone out on community placement and met the criterion for success; and those who had failed at community placement, along with those who had not attempted such placement because they were not deemed ready by staff. The total ratings were found to be not significantly related to the criteria.

Barrett, Relos, and Eisele (1965) evaluate the relationships between an attitudes test on money and related matters, and job success rather variously defined in several geographic areas.

Song and Song (1967) report on the relationships of selected elements to job efficiency as rated by employers of institutional retardates who were employed for at least two weeks.

In somewhat related areas, Macmillan (1962) has stressed the importance of effects of post-discharge variables on the careers of dischargees.

Dingman, Eyman, and Tarjan (1965) discuss the relationships between the type of statistics used and the type of data being examined.

Of interest in a larger context of sociocultural etiology is the work by Zigler, Butterfield, and Goff (1966) on creation of a rating scale of social deprivation prior to institutionalization, and the relationships between types of ratings and types of institutional performance and behavior.

Kugel and Parsons (1967) report on the results of applied effort to counteract the effects of sociocultural deprivation.

A volume of a different color is that by Robert Edgerton (1967) who presents an anthropological analysis of a group of mildly retarded institutional dischargees.

In most of these predictive studies referred to above, emphasis is placed on relatively short-range prediction. In some cases the range is so abbreviated that the process is one of identification rather than prediction.

In some instances, the criteria are not actual differing results but rather opinions (e.g., of social workers or other staff) of the subjects' eligibility for differing results. In some cases the alternatives are rather narrowly defined -- alternate paths for a carefully selected and defined group; in others, the group is more broadly inclusive and the alternatives are more widely spaced.

In some cases, an actual change of status is investigated: whether the subject will leave the institution or not; whether the subject will leave the training school for community placement or be transferred to an adult custodial institution; whether he will succeed on vocational placement and be discharged or fail and be returned to the institution; whether he will experience six months of vocational leave or not; whether he will obtain a job or not. Many of these investigations seem to be concerned with switching operations or decision points, and are attempts to say in advance which individuals will be routed in which of two or three different directions. The actual switching itself is perhaps often determined by direct staff decisions, or by decisions based on some kind of trial performance in which the institution or other interested (paternal, directive) entity plays a considerable part.

For various reasons it would seem that the relationships between temporally rather widely separated segments of the human life sequence have not been especially subject to investigation in this context of predictive retardation studies. Specifically delineated variables (rather than very general ones) occurring in early infancy and childhood for instance are not especially tested out against quite specific adult criteria of post-discharge time. The collected assortment of possible variables at time of discharge is not tested out for quite specific criteria some five or ten years after the time of discharge. In many studies although investigation is made of a group of dischargees who have been released from a particular institution in a progressive sequence over a five or ten year period, the actual criteria are set or established at or close to the actual moment of discharge rather than some years subsequently. Or the variables tend to be tested out against very broad categories (e.g., discharged vs. not discharged) rather than against the specifics within a separate category -- such as, for example, the extremes of good and poor performance within a group of discharged as capable of self-support. (Although initial attempts have been made in this area, they have not yet been significant, and the criteria have been subjective rather than objectively based and described.)

In a very general way of course the studies of R.J.R. Kennedy and others that are broadly descriptive do test a rather general hypothesis (e.g., that the educable retarded function acceptably in society) and as such they may be said to be generally supporting of a general prognosis.

The great complexity of the swirling morass of seemingly meaningful factors that apparently contribute somehow to good or poor adjustment of retardates in society is reflected in the very wide coverage of variables that have been tested for significance. The best introduction to and discussion and analysis of this complex field is undoubtedly provided by Windle's already cited survey (1961).

METHODOLOGY

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population under study consisted of all those patients who were discharged from Pineland Hospital and Training Center from July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1961. The total number formally recorded on the discharge book for this period was 575, but for certain technical reasons (e.g., the double entry of a dischargee, if the first entry was legally invalid, etc.) this total was reduced to 569. Of these, 325 were males and 244 were females. Pre-discharge information on all of these was of course obtainable from the case histories.

Rather than selecting a random sample of this population, an attempt was made to take the entire population for study. As a result of techniques used and effort expended, better than 98% of this population was actually located, and relevant post-discharge information obtained about them. Five hundred and sixty dischargees were located, 320 of these being males and 240 being females. Therefore, for all practical purposes, the located sample was almost identical with the population, as only 9 subjects were not covered.

This group then represents almost all of the patients who were discharged from one state's sole residential institution for the retarded, over a nine year period. Although differences may be expected among various state institutions for the retarded throughout the country, it may be logically assumed that they have a considerable number of elements in common, and that their dischargees would also have many similarities.

Because of the expanded scope of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, the retarded are very much among those who now seek or require its services, counsel, and other related help. Dischargees from an institution for the retarded almost always constitute a quite specialized, unique, and all too often unfamiliar group among the retarded in general. For the reasons previously cited under "Statement of the Problem," these institutional dischargees seem particularly deserving of the study, interest, and understanding of those who are concerned with serving them.

A quite full and complete statistical description of the entire population under study will be found in the TABULAR SUPPLEMENT, separately bound, that accompanies this report. In this supplement, separate sections describe the three major life periods of the dischargees -- from birth to time of institutionalization, the institutional period, and the post-discharge phase.

Also accompanying this report, and separately bound, is a BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT. This too attempts to cover the entire discharge population, not by describing each one, but by presenting cases illustrative of various types, capacities, and mental levels.

The statistical analysis that was undertaken on the IBM 360 Computer at the Computing Center of the University of Maine in Orono, deals with a more limited group of subjects, selected from the entire population of dischargees. Here, an effort was made to identify predictive, pre-discharge factors associated with certain types of post-discharge behavior that was related to self support and self sufficiency. As the aim was to determine differences among those logically qualified for such behavior, then those obviously or fairly obviously not qualified for it, if included, would only confuse or cloud the results, and therefore seemed to require exclusion. One could not expect, for example, the ability for self support among young children, the aged, or the very severely mentally handicapped.

A somewhat arbitrary screening was therefore made of the total population. Excluded from the more complex statistical analyses were all dischargees with IQ's below 50 at time of discharge, all dischargees who were under 18 and over 62 years of age at the time of the follow up interview and data collection, and all those dischargees who had been subsequently more or less permanently institutionalized. After such screening, the group for complex statistical analysis numbered some 231 males and 179 females. For certain limited categories of this analysis, a further screening was made to exclude those dischargees who for a total period of twelve months or more immediately prior and up to the time of follow up had been in some way institutionalized (correctional, mental, etc.) and thus removed from the labor market. Eighteen additional males and 12 additional females were thus excluded. With certain of the categories for analysis, these figures, for technical reasons, will be found to vary slightly from the cited totals.

The design of this study did not incorporate the use of experimental or control groups but, rather, dichotomized or otherwise divided the entire group being analyzed into subgroups for the comparisons.

VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESES

For the potentially self supporting group, delimited as described above, the aim of the more complex statistical analysis was to establish several types of objectively determinable post-discharge behavior favorably associated with self sufficiency and self support, and then to identify those pre-discharge variables predictively associated with each particular type of post-discharge behavior. These dependent variables were established in the following areas: absence of police contacts; higher wage levels; full self support; and fewer changes of personal components of domicile.

Studies of dischargees, completed prior to the inception of this present one, had been content only to describe dischargee performance, or else to measure it on the basis of an evaluative model derived apparently from that of the intelligence quotient, where a total score is obtained from the cumulative and separately calculated sub-totals of a series of subscores. Toward such evaluation of dischargee "success" and "failure", varying subscores were given on each of a chosen or indicated number of categories of in-community performance, and these subscores then lumped together to arrive at a total score for the individual. Taken together, all the total scores for all the subjects studied present a continuum from "good" to "poor" community performance. Depending upon where cut-off points are placed, this total population can be divided into two or more subgroups of differing performance. Predictive factors are then evaluated in reference to these groups.

Such an approach tends to obscure whatever elements of predictability there may be in pre-discharge factors. Because "good" and "poor" community performance is established on the simultaneous basis of several types of community behavior, one subject might be classed in the "poor" group because of execrable performance in type "A" behavior, another so classed because of type "B" behavior, a third so classed because of type "C" behavior, and a fourth classed as "poor" for rather indifferent performance in all three types at once. If it is assumed that different types of social performance can and do have diferent etiologies, then this grouping or lumping together of subjects scored according to performance in several types of behavior dilutes the more specific cause and effect relationships, and so lessens pre-discharge predictability. In addition, there is a tendency for this obscuring effect to be magnified because of the mutual exclusiveness of certain types of "poor" behavior. For example, the subject serving a fairly lengthy prison sentence cannot be simultaneously a public welfare recipient.

As noted, the dependent variables are objective rather than subjective ones, and the four types are discussed in more detail below. Although subjective criteria are interesting, it is felt that these quite impressionistic and value-based subjective ratings often leave much to be desired for use in statistical analysis since they can and often do have relatively poor inter-rater correlation, making their validity rather questionable.

The absence of police contacts has inverse reference to the area of illegal behavior, which is concerned with active and formally recognized antisocial or unsocial activity. At its one extreme illegal behavior results in the individual being placed permanently out of circulation through imprisonment, and nullifies him completely for activity in the larger society. At its other extreme (short of its total absence), it has probably only slight and temporary nuisance value (e.g., minor violations, such as motor vehicle ones). Between these extremes, illegal behavior clearly hampers regular social performance by removing the individual from time to time from life's normal activities and making for him purely mechanical difficulties of re-entry (e.g., someone else got his job). It also gives the individual a clearly negative stigma that can directly limit and penalize his employability range.

Higher wage levels, relatively considered in the dischargee group, reflect a measure of the individual's economic performance pragmatically rated -- that which he is capable of doing combined with what he is willing to do. Society evaluates his work, rewards him accordingly with money, and this flexible commodity provides him with certain social powers in relation to goods, persons, and events.

The category of full self support since discharge is concerned with the dischargee's ability and desire to engage in a particular role, that of the worker. Although allowances can be made in our affluent society for non-employment, automation has not reached to point where "all of the people all of the time" can be idle. Therefore work continues as a necessity in our society, and hence is a virtue. The individual who works steadily at a job, no matter how humble, contributes to the welfare of his society.

The category of fewer changes of personal components of the domicile relates to interpersonal stability. The human animal is one that enters into emotional and contractual relationships that provide him and his fellows with a continuing network of mutual support. Since these relationships are complex in nature and require rather delicate inter-adjustments, they necessarily are more efficient and valuable when they are of relatively longer duration. We would wonder to some degree about the individual who in his personal domicile lived successively with ten different persons in as many years. The anchorite in his own way has adjusted to a disability, but the individual undergoing constant interpersonal changes shows that he is unwilling or unable to form lasting ties of mutual support, and accordingly his general social, and hence economic performance necessarily cannot progress beyond a certain limited level.

The independent variables were taken from a rather wide and eclectic selection of pre-discharge elements. In nature these were social, psychological, cultural, experiential, and individual. They were derived from the two major pre-discharge life periods -- that from birth to the time of institutionalization, and the institutional period; two transitional periods were also included. Computer abilities to screen and examine large quantities of data made possible this rather wide selection of independent variables.

In a world without computers, the necessarily limited selection of a few independent variables would be graced by the title of hypothesis. With our work, in which a computer could be used, the aim in this area was not to hypothesize but to examine a large number of elements for their predictive possibilities. Initially, a quite extensive listing of elements was made, and all cases recorded for these, and totals for all cases then collectively obtained. With some of these variables, the recorded occurrences for all cases were so infrequent, irregular, or otherwise unsuitable that these variables were omitted. Additional screening of the pre-discharge variables was done on the basis of extremely one-sided distributions, which made them less useful for predictive purposes. A final screening, dictated by the maximum number of variables acceptable to the computer regression program, was necessary, and this accomplished in part on the basis of suggested significances in other, related studies.

Major categories noted and scored for the first life period, from birth to institutional admission include the following: birthdate, birthplace, sex, civil status, children (if any) legitimate and illegitimate, religion, level of social functioning, employment, general health, behavior regarding property (theft and/or destruction), behavior toward persons (parents, peers, etc.), sexuality, general obedience or "law-abidingness," escapes, miscellaneous antisocial acts, type of education, amount of education (including achieved grade and social promotion grade), previous IQ, previous IQ range, language used in home of origin, age when defect was detected along with persons involved in this, history of earlier extra-social behavior of a formal nature (arrests, correctional institutions, etc.), structures of the home of origin, legitimacy-illegitimacy of birth, cause of parental separation (if so), number of changes of family or pseudofamily structure (subdivided into periods of occurrence and age brackets), number of siblings in family unit of origin, position in sibship, ethnicity and race of parents, socio-economic class level and type of parents, religion of parents, rejection-acceptance by parents and others, family mental health, and known relatives of patient who have been variously institutionalized.

The first transitional period includes: types of admission, initiator(s), given cause(s) for action taken, and actual cause(s) for action taken.

The second major period (that which was actually spent under the supervision of Pineland) includes the following categories that are appropriately recorded or scored: age on admission, date of admission, age at discharge, date of discharge, age at first separation from the school, date of first separation, duration of actual stay at the school, duration of legal stay at the school, IQ on entry, IQ nearest to discharge, maximum and minimum ranges and types of recorded IQ's in this period, type of psychological diagnosis on entry and on discharge, etiological diagnosis, emotional stability, general health, type(s) of illness, physical handicaps (types and degree), academic training received (achieved grade), vocational training received (types), all other remedial treatment received (described by types), level of social functioning within the institution, attitudes toward perseverative educational tasks, attitudes toward perseverative vocational tasks, destruction and/or theft of property (or not), affect-hostility regarding teachers, peers, etc., sexuality, general obedience or "law-abidingness," escapes (number and if possible, type), other antisocial acts, family attitudes toward release, family visits to patients, patient's own sentiments toward discharge, and finally, status of charges and payments for patient's maintenance.

The second transitional period takes note of the number, type, and duration of placements directed toward discharge, causes of placement termination, to whom discharged, condition of discharge, and how discharged.

A more detailed listing of the pre-discharge variables (after their first screening) will be found in the TABULAR SUPPLEMENT, which also incorporates all the post-discharge descriptive variables, also quite numerous. It is from certain of these latter variables that the limited selection of dependent variables were derived.

The descriptive variable coverage of the subjects in the post-discharge period includes material under four general headings of economic, personal, social, and legal.

Employment data covers: the number of jobs since discharge, duration of present (or most recent) job, reason(s) for unemployment, present (or most recent) type of employment specifically described, classified by type, location of work, weekly earnings (and added benefits, if any), channels used to secure job, additional training of various sorts undertaken since discharge. The employment category necessarily shades over into other types of support and these areas include data on principal and secondary sources of present support (including persons and agencies, and temporality, external support described (type, duration, amount per week, type of aid, etc.)).

Personal data has the following categories: if now living (or if dead, year of death and cause), civil status, type of marriage, date of marriage, number of marriages, habitation with most recent spouse (or reason not), present religion.

Information concerning spouse: age and year of birth, spouse's age relative to dischargee's age, whether or not first marriage for spouse, cause of conclusion of spouse's former marriage, ethnic type, religion, social class, educational level, past and present employment status, income per week and source(s), former institutionalization at Pineland, children and number.

Domiciliary information includes: present type and exact location, length of time in present domicile, dependence or independence in domicile (in a number of categories), type of social network of the domicile, the number of physical domiciles and number of personnel domiciles since discharge. Other personal information includes military service, subsequent institutionalization and health.

Additional social and personal data covers the quality of relationships within the domicile, leisure and social activities within the domicile, degree of supervision needed, degree of self-sufficiency exercised, the amount and degree of travel since discharge, modes of transportation used (e.g., public, own vehicle, etc.), informal activities outside the home, extra-domiciliary social network (including relatives, friends, their social class and age group), durability of social relationships, formal group membership and type, donations or gifts to relatives, friends, formal charities and savings.

Finally, an additional subsection is reserved for formal and informal behavior difficulties (if any), including types of offenses, number of arrests, charges, penalties and incarcerations (types).

Two other methodological tenets entered into the design of this study. The first of these had to do with time lapse.

For such time lapse between time of discharge and time of follow up and data collection, we allowed a period that ranged from four to ten years in length (in some cases slightly longer). Most of the interviews were carried out in 1964 and 1965, with the later dischargees covered in the latter year, and some early ones before 1964. Such a time lapse seemed necessary to allow for a sufficient period for the subjects to become adjusted or non-adjusted in the larger society. Certain studies have been content to survey a single population of dischargees with post-discharge periods ranging from a few weeks to several years. The shortcomings of such an approach should be obvious.

The second tenet was concerned with dischargee location. A considerable effort was made to locate and obtain information on the largest number of dischargees as possible in our population under study. This was done on the basis of the belief that non-location attrition, because it does not occur at all at random, will present the investigator with a very biased sample. The stable, easily located discharge is a far different subject from the rolling stone who constantly moves about and leaves no forwarding address. Some studies have been content to locate as few as 50% or even 30% of a studied group, and let the rest go by default. One can only speculate on what effect the inclusion of the missing portions would have had on the results.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data Collection

Pre-discharge data for all cases was obtained from the extensive case histories on file in Pineland Hospital's Medical Records Department. Information was recorded from each case history onto appropriate sheets, and this information coded and then punched onto standard 80 column IBM cards. A numerical rather than alphanumeral coding was used throughout, with eleven cards required for the pre-discharge data on each patient. Because it had been too tightly coded in a section of one card for easy accessibility, the data on structural changes in the family in the pre-admission period was transferred to a more loosely coded twelfth card. Thus generated for pre-discharge data were some 6,828 cards.

For post-discharge data, there was no convenient and obliging Medical Records Department to fill our needs. Instead, as dischargees first had to be located before information could be obtained about them, we were initially confronted with a list of some 569 "missing persons," and a considerably challenging problem.

In the earlier, pilot stages of our project a variety of methods for locating dischargees had been developed, and these were applied to our entire population. All but 9 dischargees were eventually located and information obtained about them, with the location rate thus exceeding 98%. As these location methods have been described elsewhere (Hoffman, 1969), they need not be discussed here. Needless to say, a not inconsiderable effort had to be applied toward the location of the dischargees.

For the recording of the actual information about the dischargees, once they were located, a standard and quite extensive form was prepared. The nature of this form is reflected in the post-discharge section of the TABULAR SUPPLEMENT. Data was entered into this form from a multiplicity of sources, which included almost always a post-discharge interview with the subject and/or a responsible relative, employer, or friend, etc., with sometimes several informants being used for one subject. To the end of locating and interviewing, our social worker interviewers traveled extensively throughout Maine and the other New England states as well, as far south as Connecticut.

Other and corroborative information for the data forms came from other sources as well, and a total listing of all the dischargees was submitted to various state departments and agencies to obtain such information. The checking of records with these agencies was to determine not only that certain dischargees were known to them, but to verify that other dischargees had not had such contacts. Major sources are described below.

The State Bureau of Identification of the Maine State Police gave fully detailed record transcripts of state wide police contacts and court records, as well as similar out-of-state information reported to this bureau.

The Division of Office Services of the Department of Health and Welfare provided verifax copies of the Social Service Index listing for information on dischargees' and dischargee relatives' contacts with various state agencies and institutions.

From the Division of General Assistance of the same Department was obtained information on non-settled or state assistance cases not listed by towns, and cases supported by the Jefferson Camp for Homeless Men.

In addition, the Division of Family Services, also of the Department of Health and Welfare, gave appropriate leads to their district office records concerning the receipt of Aid to Disabled, Old Age Assistance, Aid to Blind, and Aid to Dependent Children. Prepared aid data schedules were used to obtain details on this material, largely through visits of our interviewers to the district offices where full records were kept.

For other types of public support, a prepared data schedule was used to collect information from town clerks, overseers of the poor, and city welfare departments about the receipt of city and town welfare by our located and interviewed dischargees.

Under our own Department of Mental Health and Corrections, case histories and personal information were supplied and interviews with inmate dischargees arranged by Maine State Prison, Women's Reformatory, Men's Reformatory, the Division of Probation and Parole, and Augusta and Bangor State Hospitals (mental).

Various out-of-state institutions, agencies, and departments also supplied information, most of a rather lengthy case history nature.

In cases where dischargees lived outside New England, information was obtained about them usually from several sources, including the out-of-state agencies, in-state (Maine) informants such as relatives who were in close touch with them, and questionnaires sent to the dischargees or their families.

All the post-discharge information was collected and recorded on the previously noted data forms. The data was then coded and punched onto standard 80 column IBM cards, with 15 cards for the data on each dischargee, and a total of 8,400 cards for the located population. Our complete deck of pre-discharge and post-discharge cards totalled 15,228. The recording of the collected data on IBM cards made it readily available not only for the present analysis but for a potentially large number of additional studies on retardation and the inter-relation of elements longitudinally or otherwise considered.

In addition to the statistical data, other types of information about the dischargees were also obtained. For almost all of the interviewed dischargees, the interviewers wrote descriptive essays delineating the subjects, their dynamics, and their personal and social situations. Since concrete factual data had already been recorded, a more frankly subjective and impressionistic approach could be undertaken with clear conscience. The guiding directive here was for the interviewer to tell, according to his own best opinion, whatever seemed to be the most comprehensive truth about the dischargee and his circumstances.

Following the collection of all data, tape recorded depth interviews were conducted with some 30 selected dischargees, some requiring several sessions. This material was of course transcribed to typewritten copy. More inclusive longitudinal biographies were also written on these dischargees and several others.

A note on the qualifications of those gathering the data is perhaps required. In the pilot phase of the project this material was collected by the principal investigator. Subsequently it was gathered by interviewers who had college degrees (B.A.) in various social sciences, and who received indoctrination in procedure, methods, and coverage before going into the field. Because of their personal abilities, insight, and understanding, all of these interviewers brought to the task far more than college diplomas.

Analysis

The aim of the analysis was to identify those pre-discharge independent variables most closely associated with certain post-discharge dependent variables, and then to provide working formulae for distinguishing and identifying the dichotomized or otherwise divided parts of each post-discharge dependent variable on the basis of the significant pre-discharge independent variables.

Each dependent variable was separately treated for analysis, with part or all of a group being dichotomized on the basis of difference of behavior with respect to that dependent variable. For example, all male dischargees with respect to the dependent variable of "legal behavior" were dichotomized into two groups -- those without police contacts, and those with police contacts.

The dichotomized dependent variable was then subjected to multilinear regression analysis, stepwise, to determine which of the pre-discharge independent variables best explained the difference between parts of the dichotomized groups. (A particular independent variable so identified would of course be positively correlated with one dichotomized section and negatively correlated with its opposite.)

Once a particular group of independent variables were determined to be significantly related to the dependent ones, they were used in another type of statistic -- discriminant function analysis. In this, it was determined what percentage of the dichotomized group could be correctly identified by means of these independent variables, and so, to what extent the latter acted as predictors for the type of behavior.

The divisions of the dependent variables, and the nature of the statistics used, are described in more detail below. In all cases, males and females were always separately considered, taking into account social, cultural, psychological and biological differences between the sexes.

For the category dealing with legal behavior and the absence of police contacts, the division for the regression equation was, as already noted, those with no police contacts, and those with any police contacts. For the discriminant function analysis, this same division was used, and also a tripartite one of no police contacts, police contacts with no jailings, and police contacts resulting in jailings.

For the dependent variable of wage levels, for the multilinear regression, males were divided into those in the lower 50% of male dischargee wage levels, and those in the higher 50%. In addition, the higher third was compared to the lower third, to examine intensified differences. Discriminant function analysis examined the lower 50% and the upper 50%, and then in a tripartite division examined the upper third, the middle third, and the lower third. For analysis, all females as a group were similarly treated. In addition, single females were analyzed as a group, dichotomized as to the higher and lower 50%, and married females were similarly analyzed as a separate group. The above noted divisions, and several other combinations, were essayed with discriminant function analysis. Married and single females were treated separately because marriage often tends to remove the female partially or altogether from the job market and formal receipt of wages, thus altering the wage level distribution. It should be noted that this division (for regressions) into married and single categories was recognition after the fact, although a partial compound prediction of married status and wage level was essayed, and also a separate regression analysis of married status.

The self support category was divided for the regression equations into two groups - those who had been completely self supporting since discharge, and those who had received partial (not less than 1/3) support or complete external support, continually, intermittently, or for any significant period since discharge. Married females, even though not employed on the job market for wages, were regarded as being self supporting if they were functioning at least fairly effectively in the role of housewife (some were not). This same division was used for the discriminant function analysis.

For the category of fewer changes of the personal components of the domicile, the first division for the regression analysis was between a) those who had but one set of persons in the personal domicile, those with two, and those with three sets, since discharge and b) those who had four or more sets of persons since discharge. In addition, those with two and three sets were contrasted with those who had four or more sets. The rationale here was that those with only one set might represent a rather immobilized group, those with two and three sets might be experimenting toward a permanent stability, while those with four or more were inherently much less stable. Discriminant function analysis was used to examine those with one to three sets and those with four or more, and then to examine the tripartite division of those with one set, those with two and three, and those with four and more. In our terminology in the tables the somewhat awkward generic term of "personnel domicile" is used for this category, to distinguish it from the actual physical domicile, both of which are personal domiciles.

Also examined statistically was an additional independent variable, one perhaps rather non-committal as to post-discharge success and non-success but certainly of interest in the larger context of the social behavior of dischargees. This was the post-discharge dependent variable of marriage, with the dichotomization of course providing a married group and a single group. As previously, males and females were separately considered.

The independent variables actually entering into the regression analysis were 126 in number, and these are listed in Appendix A.

Two general classes of independent variables were statistically considered, quantitative and qualitative. A quantitative variable is one in which the score of the individual can be placed somewhere on a total gradation from the less to the more; the IQ score is an example of a quantitative variable. A qualitative variable is one among several in a single class of such variables which cannot or should not be arranged in any quantitative sequence; religion is such a class, with a particular denomination being a particular qualitative variable.

For statistical analysis with the qualitative variable, each entry type of a qualitative class necessarily becomes an independent variable considered separately in opposition to all those other entry types in the same class. For example, if religion is a class, then Protestant might be considered as one variable, measured in contrast to the combined other entries considered as a group, e.g., Catholic + Jew + Greek Orthodox. Catholic as another variable in the same class would be considered in contrast to the combined grouping of Protestant + Jew + Greek Orthodox.

A degree of caution is required when an independent variable is considered for quantitative or qualitative classification in its statistical use. Often the accepted nomenclature associated with certain variables has deceptively quantitative imperatives that need closer examination. Socio-economic class, for example, running customarily from "lower" to "higher" suggests quantitative ordering, and perhaps should be so treated if income level is weighted heavily in its definition and the major interest is in its economic aspects. However, if the major emphasis is on the subcultural value system or certain other purely social aspects of the social class, then a particular social class most certainly should be considered not as a location on a quantitative variable but as one of a set of elements in a qualitative class.

Statistics

The initial screening was managed by examination of the frequency and distribution of the simple counts and percentages of all subjects' scores on each of the variables.

The next statistic used, as already noted, was a more complex one, formally identified as straight stepwise multilinear regression. The computer program for this was developed by Gerald Dube of the Computing Center at the University of Maine in Orono, for use on the IBM 360 Computer at that installation. Originally the program would handle 50 variables at once, but increased computer capacity enabled it to handle as many as 130. The term stepwise in the title has meaning in defining the nature of the statistic as compared with ordinary multilinear regression. The purpose of the statistic as here used is to identify those independent variables that best distinguish or "explain" the difference between the two parts of the dichotomized independent variable; with the stepwise regression, the most significantly correlated independent variable is introduced first, followed by the next most significant, and so on, in a series of steps and equations, with cumulative print-out at each step. This procedure, using cut-off levels of significance for the variables, can be concluded at the step when the entering variables fall below selected and indicated significance levels. This statistical procedure helps to exclude extraneous matter. In addition, if in the course of these successive steps the later introduced variables better explain the difference of the two parts, and earlier introduced variables fall below a set significance level, such earlier variables are then dropped from the equations.

The final statistic used is discriminant function analysis. This statistic, as employed in conjunction with the IBM 360 Computer at Orono, was based on a subroutines program (IBM SSP Library) System 360 - Scientific Subroutine Package (360A - CM - 03X) Version II. Pages 306 - 310 of the Programmers Manual gives a detailed explanation of the discriminant function program. The aim of this statistic is, on the basis of the previously identified significant independent variables and their characteristics, to develop formulae for identifying subjects as falling into one or the other sections of the dichotomized dependent variables. Tripartite and more complex divisions may also be examined. This process involves some weighting of the variables. A subject's scores on the independent variables are then run through two (or more) formulae, and the formula which yields the highest numerical score indicates probable membership in the group that the particular formula represents. All the discriminant function identifications as to group membership of the subjects can then be compared to actual group membership of the subjects (as located in the sections of the post-discharge dependent variable) to reveal the degree of accuracy of the discriminant function in identifying and thus predicting.

RESULTS

USE OF THE STATISTICAL TABLES

As the description of the results of the multilinear regression analyses and the discriminant function analyses will refer to somewhat lengthy tables in the Appendices, explanation of the nature of the tables and their component parts is first required.

Appendix A is the TABLE OF REGRESSIONS AND SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES. This table lists all the dependent variables and regressions used (as separate vertical columns) and all the independent variables investigated, as horizontal entries. An independent variable found to be significant for one or more regressions is listed in capitals (e.g., NUMBER OF ESCAPES), and if significant for no regressions, is listed in lower-case letters (e.g., Protestant). In the vertical column of a particular regression, the first, second, and third most significant independent variables are entered as "1", "2", and "3" respectively, and refer horizontally to the appropriate category at the left; additional significant variables are listed as "x". The manner in which the variables are correlated (positively or negatively) is given, with other information, in Appendix B. The letters "PH" in the variables mean "Pineland Hospital". "Before PH" therefore means before entry to the institution, while "At PH" means during the institutional period.

Appendix B incorporates the tables that give detailed results of the multilinear regression analyses and the discriminant function analyses. For the regressions, all the data for the particular step of the stepwise regression from which the information is derived is given (although in all cases, steps were continued well past this level, for investigation). In addition, a table of "correlations in brief" is given for each regression, as an encapsulated summary of the significant variables for each section of the dichotomy. The T Test cited is for the significance of the regression coefficient. The F Test cited gives the significance of the independent variable upon entering the equation (not at the concluding step presented). R Square is a measure of the still "unexplained" differences at the given step, on the basis of 0.00 as totally unexplained, and 1.00 as totally explained.

Most of the tables describing the discriminant function analysis are self explanatory. (Formula usage will be described in the Appendix C discussion.) The means given are those for the coded variables, and the coefficients and constants are employed in the formula usage. Mahalanobis D Square is a measure of the significance of all the variables taken together in discriminating among the two or more groups. "EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS" gives first the number of subjects evaluated by the analysis on the basis of the independent variables as belonging to the correct and incorrect groups. For example, under Males - Police Contacts (Appendix B, pages B-2, B-3), the 137 subjects of Group I actually had no police contacts; Discriminant Function I correctly evaluated 110 of actual Group I as having no police contacts, and incorrectly evaluated 27 of actual Group I as having police contacts; Discriminant Function II correctly evaluated 71 of actual Group II as having police contacts, and incorrectly evaluated 23 of this group as not having police contacts.

The next table, "IDENTIFICATION %", gives the success of the discriminant function prediction as compared to chance or random predictability levels. "% of All 1's Correctly Identified" indicates what percentage of all those subjects evaluated by the statistic as belonging to Group I actually do belong to Group I. "% of All 2's Correctly Identified" indicates what percentage of all those subjects evaluated by the statistic as belonging to Group II actually do belong to Group II. As Group I and Group II (Males - Police Contacts still as the example) differ in actual size, random identification of subjects would not be 50% and 50%, but 59.30% and 40.69% as indicated for these groups.

"% of Group I Correctly Identified" indicates what percentage of actual Group I is correctly identified. Group II is similarly treated. Here, since there are two groups, the random prediction is 50%.

Appendix C gives the actual coding used for all those independent variables found to be significant in the regression analysis. These, and the appropriate coefficients and constants are used to arrive at discriminant function scores for comparison and identification of subjects. Through the use of these various tables, our discriminant function analyses can be applied to any appropriate subject to determine his probable location in a given post-discharge grouping, and thus to predict at a better than chance level his future behavior. For example, still using "Males - Police Contacts" as the category, let us assume that a subject has been scored on the significant variables 105, 71, 78, 39, 46, 6, 48, and 32. Each of these scores for each variable is translated to its appropriate code value (from Appendix C). Each of these code values for the subject is then individually multiplied by the variable-appropriate coefficient in the Discriminant Function I Coefficient List (Appendix B, page B-2) and all the products and the Constant for that list added together to arrive at a total. Again, these same code values for the same subject are individually multiplied by the variable-appropriate coefficients in the Discriminant Function II Coefficient List, and their products and the Constant for Discriminant Function II List are added together to arrive at a total. The two totals are then compared and the higher total indicates probable membership in the group for which it stands; for example, if the total is higher for the Discriminant Function I List, the subject will probably have no police contacts. (In cases where a score for a variable is not pertinent or not available, the common means score for that variable could be substituted as a neutral element; e.g., in locales other than Maine, certain of our variables, such as ethnic ones, might not apply.)

A word on the coding for qualitative variables is needed. With any given set of these, there may be as few as two entry types or as many as seven or so. As an example, let us consider "Father's Ethnicity". Three entry types are listed for this: Yankee, French Canadian, and Other. Under the regression analysis, each type had to be considered as a separate variable, as previously described. This scheme carries over to the discriminant function analysis. "Father is Yankee" comprises Variable 39; "Father is French Canadian" comprises Variable 40; and "Father is Other" is a code entry but not a variable.

If Variable 39, "Father is Yankee" is being considered, the following coding is used for the subject: subject's father is Yankee, code value is +1 (plus one); subject's father is French Canadian, code value is 0 (zero); subject's father is Other, code value is -1 (minus one). If Variable 40, "Father is French Canadian" is being considered, the following coding is used for the subject: subject's father is French Canadian, code value is +1 (plus one); subject's father is

Yankee, code value is 0 (zero); subject's father is Other, code value is -1 (minus one). In other words, if the code entry bears the same title as the qualitative variable, the code value is always +1 (plus one); if the code entry does not bear the same title as the qualitative variable, and is not the code entry for MINUS ONE, it always has code value of 0 (zero); if the code entry is that for the last of the variable types, always listed as MINUS ONE, it always has code value of -1 (minus one).

Appendix page numbers for each Appendix Section are given in the upper right hand corner of the page.

DETAILS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSES

The compendia of results given in this section are derived from the data in the already described appendices. Before the presentation of these results, a note is in order on the information conveyed by and actually available in these appendices.

Appendix A, as noted, gives a tabular summary of the multiple relationships among all the dependent and independent variables. It indicates which independent variables are not significant, and it shows which ones are significant, and if they are so for one, for a few, or for several different regressions, and it gives their order of significance for each regression.

Appendix B gives in reasonably full detail the results of some 15 different multilinear stepwise regression analyses, and some 16 different discriminant function analyses. If we are to adhere to the central aim of this project report in the space prescribed, it is not possible to go into detailed discussion of many aspects of these results. Certainly of interest would be a discussion of the nature of the etiological operation, and the psychological, social and other dimensions of each of the independent variables found to be significant. Also worthy of discussion is the more complex nature of the differential profiles of independent variables related to each of the various regressions, and the differential profiles of the means of these variables as they define and are related to each of the two or more differentiated groups subsumed by each set of discriminant function analysis.

For these and other potential areas of interest, the basic source material of the computer output has at any rate been presented in fairly complete form for examination and study in some detail by the interested scholar or researcher.

RESULTS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Legal Behavior

Males. The multilinear regression for this category dichotomized the dependent variable into "No Police Contacts" and "Some Police Contacts" (page B-1). Eight independent variables were identified for use, the most significant of these relating to the number of escapes from the institution, and the legal duration of the institutional stay.

The variables positively associated with police contacts were: numerous escapes from the institution; shorter legal stay at the institution; poor emotional stability at the institution; subject's father ethnically a Yankee; subject's father of town or urban background; property theft by the subject before institutionalization; educational level of subject's mother was from 4th to 8th grade through high school incompleted; and subject not first born of his sibling group. The converse correlations with the no police contact group are also listed briefly on page B-1.

The first discriminant function analysis, significant at the .001 level, differentiated between these same two groups (pages B-2, B-3). Of those identified, as having no police contacts, nearly 83% were correctly identified, compared to a 59% chance level. A 72% rate of accuracy pertained to subjects identified as having police contacts, this rate being some 32% above the chance level of 40% (page B-3).

A second discriminant function analysis (page B-4, B-5) using the same variables divided this population into three groups: those with no police contacts, those with police contacts but no jailings, and those with police contacts resulting in jailings. Some 67% of the total were correctly identified, this being lower than the prior level of 78% for the total in the first discriminant function analysis, but very considerably above the 33% chance level for this tripartite division. The highest actual identification rate of 84% was for subjects without police contacts, but the 68% rate for subjects with jailings was the one highest above a chance identification rate of 25% for these subjects.

All of these rates, whether for classes of subjects or for groups, were considerably above chance levels.

Females. No analyses for female dischargees are presented here. A behaviorally encouraging but statistically disappointing very low police contact rate for females (about 4% of all female dischargees, including those not qualified for this analysis) made such analysis impossible, as the police contacts group would have been too small for use in statistical comparisons. This low police contact rate is, however, a significant result in its own right.

Self Support

Males. The multilinear regression for this category (page B-6) dichotomized the dependent variable into "Full Self Support Since Discharge" and "Partial and No Self Support Since Discharge." Qualifications for the second grouping have already been described. Eight independent variables were identified for use. The most significant, a rather obvious one, was whether or not the subject had been discharged as capable of self support. This variable, however, accounted for only a small portion of the difference between the two groups. The next most significant variable related to negative social history before institutionalization (the components here had been arrests, placements in correctional institutions, and a much smaller number of placements in mental institutions).

The independent variables positively associated with full self support were the following: discharged as capable of self support; no negative social history before institutionalization; subject had experienced rejection or other negative treatment by his father; retardation "identified" when subject was of an older age; subject was not the last born in his sibship; subject had not been in subprimary to second grade academic classes at the institution; subject had good attitudes toward academic work while at the institution; and the initiators of institutionalization were not the subject's mother and father. The converse correlations with partial and no support are also briefly listed on page B-6.

Discriminant function analysis (pages B-7, B-8) was significant at the .001 level. Very slightly less effective than the analysis for the first discriminant function for police contacts, it nevertheless correctly identified almost 75% of the total, as against a 50% chance figure (page B-8). Some 78% of those identified as fully self supporting were correctly identified, as over a 57% chance level. Almost 70% of those identified as partially or fully not self supporting were correctly identified, as compared to a 42% level for chance.

Females. For the regression, a dichotomization identical with that for males was made (page B-9). The relationship of marriage to self support for females has been previously described. Six independent variables were positively associated with full self support, these variables being entirely different ones than those for the males. The first and second most significant ones were eugenic sterilization, and property destruction at the institution, both with a rather lower level of significance than the (different) variables for the males.

Positively correlated with full self support were: eugenic sterilization; no property destruction by the subject at the institution; few or no home visits made by the subject; no physical illnesses at the institution; additional other types of training at the institution (an index of wider vocational potential, as expressed in other training beyond standard courses); and earlier year of discharge from the institution. Two of these variables need further comment: "eugenic sterilization" is a highly complex area, somewhat related to an earlier year of discharge, to institutional policies, and to post-discharge social responsibilities; "earlier year of discharge" probably reflects a more cautious and conservative institutional policy of discharge in the 1952 - 1957 period.

Discriminant function analysis (pages B-10, B-11) examining the same dichotomization, was significant at the .001 level. Some 72% of the total were correctly identified, as against a 50% rate for chance. A 79% rate of accuracy pertained to subjects identified as fully self supporting, compared to a 59% rate for chance identification. A lower rate of accuracy, 64%, for subjects identified as not fully self supporting was relatively somewhat higher, compared to the 40% level of chance identification for these subjects.

Wage Levels

Males. Two different regressions were run for males. In the first of these the dependent variable of wage levels was dichotomized into an upper 50% and a lower 50% (page B-12). Six independent variables were identified for use.

The most significant of these related to the year of discharge.

The variables positively associated with male dischargees in the upper 50% of male dischargee wage levels were: earlier year of discharge from the institution (suggesting a more cautious policy of discharge); higher social school grade levels achieved before admission to the institution; enrollment in 3rd to 8th grade at the institution; numerous escapes from the institution; expressed wish for release and discharge by the patient; and home structure when subject was 1 year old included both parents. The converse correlations with the lower 50% of wage levels are also listed briefly on page B-12.

Those variables associated with the upper 50% suggest: more cautious screening, more inner motivation, better academic education, and sounder home structure in the first year of life.

In the second regression, the same population was divided into two groups (page B-13), the lower third and upper third (with the middle third omitted) in order to examine a more sharpened contrast between extremes. A somewhat more extended list of 11 independent variables was identified for use. The most significant of these were: age at which retardation was identified, and higher IQ on discharge.

The independent variables positively associated with the upper third of male income levels were the following: retardation identified (before admission) when subject was at an older age; subject's IQ on discharge was higher (than other group); concerning the subject there was either no psychological diagnosis or there was a favorable one; subject was younger on discharge; when subject was one year of age, home structure consisted of relatives (not parents) or foster parents; subject's attitude toward vocational tasks at the institution was not at average to poor level; subject had been classified at a lower mental level on admission to institution; when subject was 10-14 years old, there had been more structural changes in the home; subject was discharged at an earlier year (e.g., 1952-1957); subject had had 4-10 working trial visits leading to discharge, and had not had zero trial visits. The converse correlations, listed in brief on page B-13, should also be examined. Those variables relating to the higher third suggest among other things higher intellectual, psychological, and motivational elements, both inherent and as expressed toward the subject through institutional curriculum. There is very little correspondence among specific variables of the two regressions, yet considerable agreement in the more abstract areas.

The first discriminant function analysis (pages B-14, B-15) examining the lower 50% and upper 50% of wage level groupings, attempted a rather massive approach by using the independent variables from each of the two regressions. With significance at the .001 level, this analysis identified better than 72% correctly. Approximately the same rates applied to the accuracy level for lower wage level subjects and higher wage level subjects identified as such, with the chance level at 50%.

The second discriminant function analysis (pages B-16, B-17), divided the population into three groups: the lower third of income, the middle third of income, and the upper third of income. The variables used were those from the second regression (lower third vs upper third). Significance was at the .001 level. Some 56% of the total were correctly identified, as against a 33% chance level for this tripartite division. The best rate of identification, 62%, was for subjects in the upper third, compared to a chance rate of 33%. The identification level for subjects in the lower third was almost 59%, while the rate for the middle third was only 44%.

Females. Four different regression analyses were attempted for females. The first two examined the entire group. The third examined single females alone, and the fourth examined married females alone.

For all females, the dichotomization for the dependent variable in the first regression produced two groups (page B-18): the lower 50% of income level, and the upper 50% of income level. Only three independent variables were identified for use. Those positively identified with higher income were: earlier year of discharge; subject as solo or independent upon admission; and subject's father of rural or village background. The converse correlations are briefly listed on page B-18.

The second regression for all females (page B-19) was a somewhat more successful one. The lower third of the group was contrasted with the upper third, and six independent variables were selected for use. Those positively correlated with the upper third of income level were: earlier year of discharge; eugenic sterilization at the institution; subject had expressed negative attitudes and affect toward mother before admission; and had not been in the "average affect toward mother" group; initiators of admission had not been orphanage, correctional institution, mental hospital, etc.; and subject's mother had been of town or urban origin. The converse correlations are briefly listed also on page B-19.

In the third regression (page B-20) single females as a separate group were dichotomized into a lower 50% of wage levels and an upper 50% of wage levels. With this after-the-fact selection of the single, and with the smaller group size, a more successful R Square was obtained, along with the ten quite heterogeneous independent variables noted on page B-20.

A similar regression (lower 50% and upper 50%) for wage levels of married females was also quite effective and the six independent variables identified for use are listed on page B-21.

Comparative analysis of the independent variables of all four regressions can be made from Appendix A. The one independent variable consistently occurring, and with considerable significance for all four regressions, is the year of discharge. As noted, an earlier year of discharge is associated with a more cautious and conservative policy of release. The relationships among wage levels and single and married statuses are undoubtedly most complex ones.

The first discriminant function analysis (pages B-22, B-23) examines all females, divided into four groups: those in the lower third of income; those in the one-third to one-half grouping; those in the one-half to two thirds grouping; and those in the upper third. The independent variables from both regressions for all females were used. Significance was at the .001 level, and when these four groups were combined into two groups, a lower 50% and an upper 50%, the total identification rate was almost 73%, as compared to a 50% chance level (page B-23). For those identified as belonging to the lower half and to the upper half of income levels, rates of accuracy were 71% and 74% respectively, compared to the 50% chance level.

The next discriminant function (pages B-24, B-25), also for all females, examined three groups: the lower third, the middle third, and the upper third. The same independent variables were used, and significance was at the .001 level. An accuracy rate of 53% pertained to the total population in this tripartite division, with its chance rate at 33%. The greatest accuracy of identification was for those identified as belonging in the upper third. Here a 60% rate contrasted with the 33% chance rate. Other data will be found on page B-25.

After-the-fact prognosis (single status, and omission of the middle third), and small group size entered into the discriminant function analysis of wage levels for single females, described on pages B-26, B-27. The 90% rate of total identification and the other identification levels on page B-27 cannot be construed in themselves as the true predictive rates for less specifically identified subjects at the time of discharge.

This same set of conditions and this criticism apply also to the discriminant function analysis of married females, described on pages B-28, B-29. Here the identification level is considerably lower.

A final discriminant function analysis (pages B-30, B-31, B-32) attempted to identify four groups: single females lower third; married females lower third; single females upper third; married females upper third. Although significant at the .001 level, the success of identification was quite varied (page B-32). It was quite effective for the two groups of lower third, but completely ineffective for identifying single females in the upper third of income levels. Additional identification efficacy data is to be found on this same page.

Personal Domiciles

Males. The somewhat awkward title of "Personnel" is used in the tables, for the reasons previously given. For the first regression analysis (page B-33), the dependent variable was dichotomized into two groups: those with one, two, and three different "sets" of personnel in the personal domicile since discharge; and those with four and more sets of personnel. Seven independent variables were identified for use. The most significant of these dealt with emotional stability of the subject at the institution.

Independent variables positively correlated with the "four or more domiciles" group (presumably less stable) were the following: poor emotional stability at the institution; enrollment in sub-primary to second grade academic classes at the institution; admission to the institution not via probate court or voluntary (both quite pacific entry routes); initiators of admission were foster homes, state agencies, civil and town authorities; attitudes toward vocational tasks at the institution were in the average to poor range; subject had not been solo and independent on admission; subject made numerous escape attempts from the institution.

A second regression analysis (page B-34) examined those with two and three sets of personnel, and those with four and more. Six independent variables were identified for use, and the most significant of these was the quality of affect toward peers during the institutional stay.

Here, the independent variables positively correlated with the "four or more domiciles" group were the following: poor affect toward peers at the institution; admission not via probate court or voluntary; average to poor attitudes toward institutional vocational tasks; foster homes, state agencies, and city or town authorities as initiators of admission; lower mental level on admission; and subject not living independently or solo on admission.

The first discriminant function analysis (pages B-35, B-36) examined the two groups of one to three "sets", and of four and more "sets" of personnel, using the independent variables from the first, and comparable, regression. Significance was at the .001 level. Some 72% of the total were correctly identified, as against a 50% rate for chance. Of the subjects identified as having fewer domiciles, 78% were correctly classified, as against a 61% level for chance. Of the subjects identified as having more domiciles, almost 63% were correctly identified, compared to a 39% level for chance (page B-36). The second discriminant function analysis (pages B-37, B-38) examined three groups: those subjects with only one set of personnel since discharge; those with two and three sets; and those with four and more. The significant independent variables from both regressions were used. There was a significance level of .001.

Some 48% of the total in this tripartite division were correctly identified (page B-38), as against a 33% rate for chance. The poorest identification rate was for those with but one set of personnel, this being only 6% above a chance level. The rate for the two and three set group was 61% compared with 48% for chance, and the rate for the four and more group was 63%, very considerably above the chance level of 38%.

Females. The same types of division for regressions were essayed here. In the first regression (page B-39) in which a one to three group contrasted with a four and more group, only three independent variables were identified for use. (The R Square was quite low.)

Independent variables positively correlated with the four and more domicile group were the following: poor affect toward peers at the institution; subject discharged as capable of self support; and subject involved with the destruction of property before admission to the institution.

The second regression, as with males, examined those with two and three sets, and those with four and more (page B-40). Only four independent variables were identified for use, two of these being the same as for the first regression.

Positively correlated with the four and more group were the following independent variables: poor affect toward peers at the institution; subject discharged as capable of self support; no heterosexual acting out at the institution; and good health while institutionalized.

The first discriminant function analysis (pages B-41, B-42) examined the group with one to three sets, and the group with four and more sets, using all the independent variables from both regressions. Although there was a significance level of .001, the identification level for total population was 66%, compared with a 50% chance level. The almost 76% rate for those identified as belonging to the one to three set group was not too far above the 65% rate for chance. A 50% identification rate for the four and more group compared with a 34% for chance.

The second discriminant function analysis (pages B-43, B-44) examined three groups: those subjects with only one set of personnel since discharge; those with two and three sets; and those with four and more sets. The same independent variables were used.

The identification level for the total population was 53% as compared with the 33% chance level for this tripartite division. Identification rates for subjects separately identified as to membership in each of the three groups are also given on page B-44, and run from 12% above the chance level to 31% above the chance level. When the results for the first two groups were combined (the one set group and the 2-3 set group), the rising tide of dichotomization lifted both identification and chance levels, and gave a total identification rate of 72%.

Marital Status

Males. For the regression analysis (page B-45), males were dichotomized into the married and the single. Six independent variables were identified. R Square was relatively low.

Independent variables positively correlated with single status were the following: Retardation was identified when the subject was younger; subject had one to three working trial visits in preparation for discharge; subject also had zero trial visits before discharge; subject's general level of social ability was lower at the institution; attitudes toward vocational tasks at the institution were average to poor; and subject fell into the rather rare class of "unimproved at discharge". The converse correlations are also listed in brief on page B-45. Rather lower intellectual and general capacities appear to be associated with single status.

Because of both computer scheduling and budgetary limitations, a discriminant function analysis was not undertaken for this category.

Females. An entirely different set of four significant independent variables was identified by the regression analysis of married and single females (page B-46). Again R Square was relatively low.

Independent variables positively associated with the single state were: physical handicap; no heterosexual acting out at the institution; poor health at the institution; and father of upper middle to lower class social background. Conversely, the married had no physical handicap, were reasonably healthy, had acted out heterosexually, and had fathers not identified as to upper middle to lower class membership.

For the females a discriminant function analysis was possible (pages B-48, B-49), with 68% of the total group correctly identified, as over a 50% rate for chance. There was a 64% identification level for the married, compared to a 47% level of chance. Of those identified as single, 72% were correctly classified, as compared to a 52% level for chance.

In the above descriptions of results, of interest for more detailed examination are the actual means for the significant independent variables as these occur in the differentiated groups under the discriminant function analysis. Interpretation of these mean scores can be obtained by referring, with the appropriate identification number for the independent variable, to Appendix C where the values assigned to the codes will be found. A comparison of the means of the variables of these differentiated groups considerably elucidates the nature of these groups.

DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

The two separately bound supplements accompanying this report provide results of a different nature.

The BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT, through the presentation of selected interview reports and other material on the dischargees, aims to give in a more personal form a view of the diverse types of post-discharge adjustment, and to delineate some of the more frequently observed elements of social behavior. This supplement's purpose and coverage are more fully described in its own preface.

The TABULAR SUPPLEMENT, as noted earlier, gives descriptive statistics on a rather extensive longitudinal range of categories relating to all life periods of the dischargees from birth until the time of post-discharge interview and data collection. Even a casual reading should give convincing evidence of the unusually disadvantaged pre-institutional background, socio-culturally, psychologically, and structurally, of the great majority of this unique population. Of this total group, better than 10% were off to a dismal start through illegitimate birth, and for most, conditions grew progressively darker.

The supplement's own preface and its introductory Table Index give an overview of the nature and scope of the coverage, both specific and general. Careful reading of the tables themselves should provide considerable information on the social milieus, experiences, capacities, and performances of this group in many life areas.

It is hoped that both of these supplements, taken together as quite different yet complementary units, will add something to a fuller understanding of this unusual population.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESULTS

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESULTS FOR THE STATED PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

The results of this study should be considered in relation to and in the context of the previously stated problems and hypotheses.

As originally observed, retardation and its problems have become increasingly the concern of the Social and Rehabilitation Service and related agencies, and the retarded have increasingly turned to them for a variety of services and support -- training programs, employment counseling and placement, personal guidance, and many other forms of help.

Discharged institutional retardates constitute a very special and unique group, often marked by unusual trauma and life experiences and resulting handicaps. Special understanding is required of their problems and capacities in planning ahead for them. Identification of qualities relating to probable future performance can help to determine who in long range respects will profit most from special educational and training programs, who may require routing into special aid and support programs, and who may need special guidance to cope with indicated insufficiencies of performance.

Understanding of this group is also needed for dealing with them as individuals. A knowledge of their dynamics and the etiologies of their conditions adds a necessary qualitative personal dimension to the supportive relationship, and facilitates the finding of more suitable solutions to their problems.

While many serious and careful studies have been made generally on the prognosis of mental subnormals, a majority of these studies were such that a comparison between differentiated types of in-community performance of institutional dischargees a considerable time _after_ discharge had not been the center of focus. Or when it had been, post-discharge behavior given scores derived from an overall compound rating for quite general success and failure in the community; and the results did not notably identify significant pre-discharge independent variables.

For the purposes of this present study, it was reasoned that long-range prediction for quite specific types of post-discharge successful and non-successful behavior, objectively identified and rated, could be a worthwhile approach not hitherto adequately explored. If successful in any measure, such an approach would hopefully be of value as an aid in planning and counseling for the retarded.

In the actual results of this study, significant relationships have been arrived at concerning the relationships among the pre-discharge independent variables and the dichotomized or otherwise divided independent variables that represent the different types of post-discharge behavior. With the discriminant function analyses, most relationships are at the .001 level of significance.

Not infrequently in the literature a significant relationship, even at a 5% level, between before and after elements is honored with the title of "prediction" although instruments of prediction are absent. In our own study actual predictive identification has been made, and the operable formulae have been provided in the text as working instruments for replication. Thus, actual predictive probabilities of behavior may be attempted by other investigators or planners working with similar populations of institutional dischargees and using the designated categories and independent variables.

The types of post-discharge behavior for which predictive relationships have been established, with males and females separately considered, were the following: police contacts and their absence (females being excluded here because of their very low level of police contacts -- a finding in itself); higher and lower wage levels; full self support contrasted with partial and no self support; and domiciliary stability contrasting fewer with more changes. Marriage also was examined, with predictive formulae given to determine future marital status for females.

These predictive associations were long range and longitudinal in nature. The most recent of the pre-discharge independent variables, those of the actual time of discharge, were recorded for a time some 4 to 10 years before the time of collection and recording of the dependent variables. Thus, a gap of at least this duration separates the two types of variables. The time span is actually considerably longer in extension, as many of the pre-discharge independent variables occur not only in the institutional period considerably before discharge, but still further back in the pre-institutional period from birth to time of institutional admission. This earlier period is one for which there has been a reported paucity or absence of significant independent variables relating to post-discharge dependent variables.

An examination of Appendix A, the Table of Regressions and Significant Variables, will indicate that for the most part, quite different types of independent variables were associated with males and with females where the same type of post-discharge behavior was being examined.

Where different types of post-discharge dependent variables were examined for the same sex, considerably different sets of independent variables were identified for significance in relation to each type of such post-discharge behavior.

There is, as might be expected, some correspondence of independent variables where a particular type of behavior for one sex is being examined in more than one divisive manner for that type of behavior (e.g. the lower half of wage levels compared to the upper half, and then the lower third of wage levels compared to the upper third).

A small and very limited number of independent variables do occur in relation to more than one type of post-discharge behavior, but not a single independent variable has across-the-board occurrence as significant for all types of behavior. "Year of Discharge" is probably the most significant in this respect, occurring in 7 of the 12 regressions. "Average to Poor Attitude toward Vocational Tasks" occurs in 4 of the 12 regressions, and all the rest of the independent variables are of lesser occurrence.

As all 126 independent variables were examined in each of the regressions for all the different types of behavior, this relative lack of correspondence of single independent variables for multiple identification of quite different types of post-discharge behavior would appear to support our original hypothesis; it had been maintained that different types of post-discharge behavior should be separately examined, as they most probably had quite different etiologies and therefore would be identified by quite different independent variables.

The nature of the distribution of the post-discharge behaviors lends additional support to such separate analysis. If there were marked coincidence of location for large numbers of subjects in the "successful" segments of all dichotomies, and for equally large numbers in the "non-successful" segments of all dichotomies, then successful identification of a subject for location in one dependent variable would coincidentally serve to locate that subject in all the other dependent variables as well.

However, such large-scale coincidence is absent. With the males, for example, only 17% of the entire group enjoys a quadruple "successful" range location (of higher wages, full self support, fewer domiciles, and no police contacts). Some 5% of males are in the "non-successful" range on all four counts; for those cases where wage levels and self support had to be excluded, an additional 5% of males were in a double "non-successful" category. Thus, about 72% of males were not located coincidentally in either of these multiple extremes.

An important component in this study and the examination of these relationships has of course been the use of the modern computer and related data processing equipment, which have permitted statistical analysis on a scale hitherto neither practical nor even really possible.

A factor assuring another kind of reliability of results has been the better than 98% rate of location of the dischargee subjects. This rate was achieved by the determined application of certain methods of location developed in the pilot phase of this study. Appreciable non-random attrition caused by the failure to locate certain types of subjects can leave the investigator with a very distorted sample. Such non-random loss in our study would appear to be quite minimal.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE STUDY AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Of the problems encountered in this study, one of considerable importance is the rate of predictive identification. This rate is not 100% accurate in its identification of subjects as to types of post-discharge behavior, yet it is far above chance levels of identification.

Of interest here are the possible explanations for this intermediate state, and the implications for use of the predictive instruments and for the efficacy of remedial and counseling work in the post-discharge period.

Of the several explanations that present themselves for this intermediate predictivity, the following may be considered:

The type of statistic used, the multilinear regression analysis, may not provide the best possible fit or model for the complex inter-relationships among the dependent variables and the many independent variables. Other mathematical models, and other types of statistics developed or developable might yield more effective results.

Or, the types of inter-relationships that exist among the pre-discharge independent variables, as these have been selected and used, and the post-discharge dependent variables may actually involve so many elements interacting in so many ways and so complexly that no presently established or establishable mathematical analysis can abstractly subsume all the conditions. Each case therefore must necessarily remain in some part a unique and complicated set of conditions in and of itself.

There may be types of independent variables usable today -- complex mental or biochemical tests and other analytical and descriptive instruments -- that would have served as better predictors but which were not available or not recorded in the data of the case histories that reach quite far into the past. And there may be predictive elements present yet not presently accessible or decodable, even as the fertilized ovum bears coded within itself, indecipherable yet certain, the complete instructions for the creation of a fully developed adult. From a wholly speculative position of extreme biogenetic determinism, for example, there may exist in each individual from the earliest age real but unreadable patternings for rather general behavioral expressions in childhood, youth, maturity, and old age.

For the intermediate levels of prediction encountered, there is still another explanation, perhaps more likely and also more attractive. With this, it would be assumed that the patient on discharge from the hospital is by no means a mute projectile launched on some inevitable trajectory into a social vacuum where he will act out his sum of past inner directives without influence from his environment. The dischargee is indeed a social being, one who will interact with others, be reacted to and acted upon, and in general be subject to a thousand and one completely unpredictable external impulses, urgings, and deterrents for continued or altered direction of his trajectory at every point of his journey. A priori reasoning and the examination of post-discharge histories, illustrative examples of which are given in the Biographical Supplement, lead one to an inevitable conclusion: although a considerable portion of what an individual does depends upon inner directives, another very considerable portion of what he does and what happens to him depends upon other persons, circumstances, and events. This whole subject of behavioral tendencies and multiple potentialities is of course a complex one. The dangers and inherent advantages of partial predictability in this context of varying post-discharge influences acting upon the dischargee and his behavior are discussed in a subsequent part of this section.

A problem in a different area of this research has been that of computer time and the availability of computer center personnel for assistance with the work. When so many accomplishments, incredible only a few years ago, can and have been done for us by these facilities, it is perhaps inevitable to wish for still more. Today, computer science in general and university computer centers in particular are in a period of phenomenal growth. The expanding demands made upon the centers nevertheless far outpace their expanding capacities. If this study had been conducted at some millenial time of infinitely great computer speed, capacity, and availability, and of more facile and immediate communication between man and machine, it would certainly have been interesting and perhaps even profitable to have subjected our dependent and independent variables, and others as well, to further analyses of the type already employed, and to still other types of statistical examination and inquiry.

As previously noted, it is not possible in this limited space to discuss and interpret the meaning and meaningfulness of each independent variable's occurrence in each regression, nor the significance of the combined profiles of the variables. Several areas relating to the single or multiple distribution of the independent variables would be of particular interest for speculative consideration or fuller discussion in a more voluminous report. Some examples with brief notes are given below:

The occurrence of a particular independent variable on the "successful" side of one dichotomy and on the "non-successful" side of a different type of dichotomy is of interest. For example, more numerous male escapes from the institution are positively correlated with police contacts and also with higher wages; here, although one might take evasive refuge in levels of significance and probability, the thought of greater motivational impetus, directed and misdirected, might also be considered.

Another area of interest is the superficially somewhat heterogeneous or at times even contrastive quality of independent variables associated in some instances with certain halves of dichotomies; circumspect analysis here usually suggests a more abstract unity of subsumption.

With the multilinear regression analyses of certain dependent variables, somewhat different selections of independent variables occur in some of the cases where a regression considers the lower half and the upper half of a group, and a second regression considers the lower third and the upper third of the same group. To explain these discrepancies, an appropriate model could be designed to take into account the distributions, weightings, and effects of the independent variables in the upper and lower halves of the middle third (that is, the third sixth and fourth sixth).

In some instances where a single class of qualitative variables is involved, there may be the occurrence of more than one variable from such a class characterizing the same dichotomized portion of a dependent variable for a group. Independent qualitative variables A and B, for example (of a qualitative class including A, B, C, D, and E) might both be positively correlated with one half of a dependent variable. A review of the nature of qualitative variables explains this problem. However, as each particular qualitative variable is necessarily treated in a regression as being at an opposite pole from all others of its class, there would appear to be some potential statistical weaknesses here, apparent and perhaps hidden. In the above noted millenial time of computer availability, further examination of and experimentation with such statistical problem areas would be on the agenda.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

As to the possible reasons for the study outcome, it might seem not unreasonable to assume that the hypotheses had been correct, that earlier experiences leave their mark and earlier behaviors have their momentum, and that such elements of the institutional and pre-institutional periods do indeed endure and tend to have their continued expression in specific types of behavior a considerable time later in the post-discharge period.

The results of this study would seem to suggest several areas of implication for theory and practice.

The discriminant function formulae as they are presented in the text may be applied to similar populations and individuals at a time fairly close to institutional discharge. Tentative probabilities may thus be determined for different types of future behaviors, with these scores serving to aid in decisions as to subjects' probable eligibility and suitability for various types of training programs, psychiatric or psychological treatment and therapy, types of personal counseling, and various placements that make greater and lesser demands upon the subjects.

Where some of the independent variables are not directly applicable because of regional or other variations, suitable approximations can be made; (for example, with the variable "Year of Discharge", the years 1952 - 1957 would, as already noted, represent a more conservative policy of discharge, while the years 1959 - 1961 would stand for a more audacious policy.) Or, the given means for the whole group can be substituted as a neutral element for each case in each discriminant function formula. As previously cautioned, these formulae do not absolutely identify future behavior for all subjects of a group; and for similar populations in other areas their rates of identification could well be lower than those of our own results.

Ideally, therefore, to determine such other identification levels more precisely, the approach of this study should be retested for similar populations of institutional dischargees in other areas. Such retesting, based on follow up of subjects a considerable time after discharge, would take into account the possible effects of other ethnic, subcultural, and economic elements less well represented in our own study.

The apparent relative success of this study would seem to recommend a more general experimental application of its hypotheses and methods to quite different populations and quite different types of inquiry. There are of course a number of areas in which it is both of interest and importance, on the basis of present information, to determine at better than chance levels what a subject's performance may be not in an immediate tomorrow but at some considerable time in the future. Educational, employment, mental health, and correctional fields as these relate to normal or to physically handicapped or otherwise disadvantaged persons, are some of the general areas where longer range prediction might be profitably studied. Our methodology has included: the use of longitudinally distributed independent variables, some of which are derived from subjects' earliest years; a significant lapse of time before follow up; and the division of investigated behavior, when too loosely categorized or subjectively rated, into several subtypes that can be objectively measured and examined.

Some further notes on predictive formulae and the nature of prediction are in order.

The application of one set of formulae to a particular population produces two groups; one group will by prediction be "successful" in this type of post-discharge behavior, while the other group will be "non-successful".

In the actual outcome, and with no planned intervention, about 80% of each group will perform as predicted, and about 20% of each group will not do as predicted.

Implied here is a tendency for each group to do as predicted, "everything else being equal". The failure of the 20% to do as predicted may be ascribed in part to difficulties of statistical identification, but is far more likely due to post-discharge influences and processes that intervene, negate the tendency, and redirect the behavior into other channels of expression.

It would seem not impossible under experimental conditions to select sets of post-discharge circumstances in which a considerably larger portion of each group might fail to do as predicted, and in which the ratio of correct to incorrect predictions might even be reversed.

A danger in the use of the predictive instrument lies therefore in regarding the identified tendency as an absolute and unchangeable certainty, and in treating the identified "successful" subjects as if they could not possibly fail, and treating the identified "non-successful" ones as if they could not possibly range higher.

As an ideal goal, one might hope that all, or most, of a population -- rather than a predicted half -- could perform in the upper or "successful" range. Such a goal is by no means too unrealistic as the actual range of behavior is such that an approximate half of the population can already succeed in achieving the higher level.

The 30% improvement over chance levels of identifying tendencies is certainly a gambler's edge worthy of some respect and one that would yield a profit in agriculture, Wall Street, or Monte Carlo. Although this predictive instrument might be used for assigning subjects to inevitable fates, it would, where the human being is the unit of the wager, be far more effectively employed in determining the best probable remedial routings for all subjects so that as many as possible could attain "successful" or higher range performance.

Areas of circumspect use might include the choice of identified "successful" subjects for more or less standard education and training programs where enrollment was for some reason limited and not all applicants could be accepted, and where personal counseling and therapy were minimal. Employment programs with similar conditions or with some degree of required selectivity for pragmatic program survival would be another area for identified "successful" cases.

Those falling into the lower or "non-successful" range of identification might be more helpfully placed in programs incorporating special counseling, psychiatric or psychological treatment and therapy, and more personal supervision in education, training, or work placement situations.

In certain extreme cases where other negative factors were present, a predictive instrument might assist in making the decision for or against placement in a limited aid program. It might be noted in passing that the remedial counteracting of a predicted non-successful tendency serves to negate the value of the prediction.

The existence of post-discharge process, with all of those sets of circumstances, persons, and events that serve to maintain a subject in his more probable expressions of behavior, or serve to divert him from such expressions, emphasize the importance of another area of effort -- that of controls over such process not at the time of discharge but during the post-discharge period.

If the post-discharge condition of the retardate with his often quite special problems and needs is susceptible to alteration and change, then it is vital that proper and relevant services exist, have cognizance of these problems and needs, and be available and accessible to those that require them. Half-way houses, sheltered workshops, and specialized agencies are among the entities that can serve to maximize the potential of institutional dischargees and keep them from the difficulties and misuse of capacities that occur in the lower and non-successful ranges. Predictive instruments could well be used as an aid in arriving at a selection of dischargees for post-discharge programs with lesser and greater degrees of supervision and counseling.

In a more generalized area than direct services, but influencing their phraseologies, there are still many problems created by society's rather unsatisfactory legal and cultural definitions and treatment of the retarded with their many levels of competence, and affecting such categories as marriage and marriageability, procreation, legal status in criminal problems, money management and financial responsibility, and employment and employability status.

In all of these categories a major structural difficulty seems to be caused by the binary definition of the retarded person, as classified and treated in either of two extreme conditions, with no gradations between. This state of affairs is much as if all normal children of school age had only a choice being in kindergarten or in the senior class of high school.

If he is without interested parents, relatives, or friends to take up the slack for intermediate levels in socially informal ways, the adult retardate in the employment and employability field, for example, must be either capable of self support or he must be "totally and permanently disabled" by reason of his retardation in order to qualify for steady external support in the form of Aid to the Disabled. These definitions work well enough for the relative extremes that they comfortably fit. For the individual who falls somewhere in between these extremes, there are two not very workable choices. If the individual is classed as capable of self support (when he is only partially so), he must be subjected to extremely impoverished times with inadequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical attention, and with problems of going onto and off welfare or other charitable, marginal support. If however the same individual is classed as "totally and permanently disabled", he is not allowed to work at all lest he lose his eligibility for external support, and so he must sacrifice what useful and personally rewarding abilities he actually has in order to fit the classification of human economic vegetable.

It is possible that future widened definitions of what the A.D. recipient may earn, and newer movements within Social Security programs, with concepts of minimum income levels and negative income tax, may supply better answers to these problems. But as the staggering welfare burdens of the larger metropolises testify, there promises to be no easy or simple solution to any of these problems. The retarded person with a long institutional background and considerable mental handicap may arrive at an ideally protected situation, but he can also be particularly vulnerable to the effects of binary definitions of his capacities.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FINDINGS FOR USE IN THE FIELD

The individual social and rehabilitation worker in the field, when confronted with an ex-patient recently discharged from an institution for the retarded, may be only too aware of the gap that exists between ideal programs for the retarded and what is actually and immediately available. Social reforms are on a more distant horizon, and an immediate effort must be made to resolve the client's immediate problems. Whether optimum other resources are available or not, the major resource is always the worker's own ingenuity, wisdom, and understanding of the client.

Some suggestions on the applicability of the results of this study to use in the field may or may not be helpful:

The predictive formulae, as presented in the text, may be used for identification of the dischargee's probable performance in the designated areas of post-discharge behavior. Information on the independent variables for these formulae might best be obtained from institutional case records; probably an ideal situation would be one in which the worker and his agency bore some kind of fairly close and continuing working relationship with the institution.

These predictive instruments cannot be regarded as absolute. For the reasons already cited, they should be used cautiously and in conjunction with other evaluative methods and personal judgement in arriving at decisions.

One area of application might be the determining of eligibility for different types of training or employment programs. The instrument might also serve to aid in determining how much personal supervision, and in what areas, the worker should provide for the client.

With any guidance procedures, whether the client is an unknown or apparently known quantity, it is important not to classify him and treat him as so irrevocably formed in one pattern of capacity and behavior that he cannot readily change for the better.

Deserving attention is an altogether different dimension of the supporting relationship of the worker with the institutional dischargee. This is the subtle and qualitative one of personal understanding and rapport that in its effects probably transcends in many ways the field of tabulated measurement and statistical analysis.

As noted, the institutional dischargee often has a unique and unusual social background, and an awareness of its special nature is a necessity in dealing with him and his problems. A dischargee may be fully identified as such, or he may present himself without certain credentials and with only vaguely described gaps in his past, as many ex-patients are understandably secretive about their institutional backgrounds.

In either case, it is important to determine in as much detail as possible the extent to which the individual has been a product of sociocultural and psychological deprivation, and has traveled the route of poverty, broken home, multiple foster home placements, or similar dreary way stations to institutional placement. Other meaningful factors are the age of the patient on admission to the institution, the duration of his stay, the qualitative nature of the institution, and the dischargee's reactions to the entire experience.

The Biographical Supplement accompanying this report gives illustrative examples of institutional dischargees and their types and levels of adjustment, and it should be of some help in providing a better understanding of this special group.

Usually setting off and distinguishing members of this group from persons who have experienced relatively "normal" backgrounds in infancy, childhood, and subsequent periods, are various salient characteristics. For any given dischargee, these characteristics may be present in varying degrees and combinations (or, rarely, may be altogether absent).

The notations that follow on such characteristics are necessarily limited in their coverage. Derived from the Biographical Supplement, they should serve more as generic fingerposts to major areas of influence than as detailed clinical presentations and analyses of those areas.

The cited past life experiences usually conspire to produce individuals with depleted reservoirs of emotional and cognitive resources that can meet only casual and inconsiderable requirements. Greater demands and frustrations, scarcely noticed by normal persons, may produce passive and defenseless shattering of some individuals or inappropriately violent and angry reactions of others. In many there may be extreme dependency needs, with excessive desire for constant succor and support. Still others may have moved a defensive step further to draw into safe and fairly invulnerable shells of minimal social participation and reaction.

In addition, there has been imposed on almost all dischargees the recognized stigma of mental retardation. Being so classified and so treated, often for lengthy periods of time within the unavoidable caste system of an institution, can leave an indelible mark. No matter how beneficent and progressive the institution, if the patient has been at an educable level, his native comprehension cannot escape the awareness that in the opinion of a large number of persons he has been less than normal. This potential sense of inferiority is one that the dischargee must live with, react to, and hopefully somehow come to satisfactory terms with. This problem area is also one regarding which a counselor or social worker should be fully and tactfully aware.

As a result of such labeling and treatment, and because of past childhood life experiences that have been bizarre, unnatural, and far beyond the range of what is considered normal by any culture, the dischargee may scarcely view the world in a normal manner. Regarding it and its constituent persons, he may have fears, expectations and reactions that bear but little relation to what most of us would see as reality.

Finally, if he has been institutionalized at an early age and for a considerable length of time, the dischargee can arrive in the larger society as much a stranger in a strange land as if he had been transported there from some primitive society. He may require basic indoctrination in a large number of commonplace customs and folkways that are familiar to most normal persons in childhood. This is not because of retardation, but simply because he has not been exposed to these elements before.

As to remedial or supportive measures that the worker should employ, these will depend very much on the individual and the circumstances, and no set of rules can substitute for informed and inspired personal judgement. In general for this type of subject, those rather archaic qualities of patience, sympathy, and kindness will still do good service when combined with an understanding of what the dischargee's past has been, and how and why he has come to be what he is. There should be expectations of growth by degrees rather than by dramatic leaps. Although the individual cannot become what his lack of potential will not allow, he cannot on the other hand move into a new and more capable identity if none will believe him capable of this.

For many a dischargee, there may be in the community no extant and supporting social network of his own to whose members he can turn for counsel and help.

Therefore, to bridge this transitional period between institutional discharge and optimum community adjustment, a measure of applied effort may be required of the rehabilitation worker. For economy of his own time and energies, the worker might best maneuver the dischargee into a suitably supporting environment. There, with some supervision and explanation, suitable employers or rooming house owners may be deputized as indigenous workers. In such situations, which should be sheltering but not smothering, the patron person, who is of course familiar with society and its workings, and who has his own established social network, ideally takes a personal interest in the dischargee and can indoctrinate him by degrees into the ways of the larger society and into more complete independence.

This subject of post-discharge adjustment is a large and complex one, and any generalities do it some injustice. Fuller discussion and illustration of the variations of this theme will be found in the Biographical Supplement.

SUMMARY

This study of the successful and non-successful community adjustment of discharged retardates has selected for separate examination several distinct types of post-discharge behavior, objectively rated, with males and females separately considered. Avoided was an overall scoring of "community success" compounded from subjectively rated subscores on vaguely defined aspects of behavior.

Salient findings of the multilinear regression analyses and discriminant function analyses supported the hypothesis that significant longitudinal relationships do exist between those independent variables derived from the period from birth to institutional discharge and those dependent variables describing the several types of successful and non-successful post-discharge behavior.

Supporting the belief that different post-discharge behaviors have different etiologies was the finding that quite different sets of independent variables are identified as significant when different types of post-discharge behavior are examined for the same sex, and also when the same type of post-discharge behavior is examined for opposite sexes.

On the basis of longitudinal independent variables available at the time of discharge, it would seem that a fairly effective degree of prediction is possible for the several types of post-discharge behavior recorded some 4 to 10 years after discharge. Discriminant function analysis produced instruments that ranged as high as 80% in their ability to identify these behaviors.

A conservative view of the results would take into consideration the need for retesting the independent variables for dischargee populations in other geographic areas where different social, economic, and ethnic conditions may prevail.

Two supplements accompany this report. A Tabular Supplement is provided to present a statistically descriptive longitudinal picture of many aspects of subjects' lives from birth to time of post-discharge follow up interview. A Biographical Supplement is provided to give specific personal illustration of a number of types and levels of post-discharge adjustment.

Employment of the findings of this study on a practical every-day basis may be managed in several ways.

The discriminant function formulae that have been provided (or ones similarly developed) may be used for predictive identification of the future probability of the various types of post-discharge behavior. Such information may be used to aid in making judicious decisions concerning guidance, therapy, education, training, employment, and placement of discharged retardates for best achieving optimum development of their potential. Any predictive instrument of this sort should be used with caution because of the dangers of an alterable or incorrect prediction being treated as an inevitable reality. Since the most reliable and complete source of data for the independent variables would probably be institutional, personal and social history records, a fairly close working relationship between the institution and the responsible agency would seem helpful, where the institution itself was not primarily involved in the programs.

Again for practical application, the Tabular Supplement should provide resource material on the nature of life aspects of the institutional dischargees, and data on the ranges of post-discharge personal, social, and employment

activities that might realistically be expected. Regarding employment, for example, the total listing of post-discharge job types and their frequencies for male and female dischargees of this population might serve to advance suggestions in this area for counselors and agencies.

The Biographical Supplement should serve to give a fuller understanding of this unique population through illustration of the combinations of various elements on personal, individual bases, and by examples of types and levels of adjustment that might ideally be expected and worked toward. Examples are also given of less than desirable adjustments and some of the kinds of problems that occur among dischargees. A sympathetic understanding of these persons, their problems, potentialities, and limitations is necessary for effectively relating with them and realistically planning for them.

On the basis of this study, certain more general observations and recommendations may be made. With the psychosocially deprived and retarded, marked by the long-range effects of their formative, or malformative years, two major areas present themselves for social concern and action.

One major area is related to the latter stages of this lengthy and tortuous cycle that has as its end product the institutional dischargee. Here, if the institution has functioned in an antediluvian, custodial manner, the emphasis must be largely remedial. Changing philosophies and policies, as in the case of Pineland Hospital, may find an institution expending major efforts in a transitional period to undo what earlier custodiality had done to its own patient population. Already noted in the "Discussion and Implications of Results" section of this report have been aspects of the post-discharge period, the importance of process and relevant services in that period, and the need for personal understanding of a special population.

The other major area for social concern is related to the beginning of the cycle. Here the emphasis should be largely on preventive work, and what can be achieved here should certainly be of equal or even greater importance than what can be managed at a later, remedial time.

This cycle, for its starting point, may have a wholly inadequate family of origin, or a responsible but quite low income family disrupted by the death or other loss of one or both parents.

Whatever the origins, once the start has been made, it has been the machinery of larger social reaction that has taken over to move the affected children into downward and destructive pathways. The agencies and officials involved, as all too often revealed in our case history records, have seemed at times like enraged angels of retribution against the predestined damned, at times like herders of some low form of life exempt from all human sensitivity and response, and at times like bored processors of inanimate objects. Exposed in times past to this upside down remediality, which assured that those who had little would receive even less, too many of our subjects endured a compounding of insult, injury, and outrage remarkable for its extremity. New policies at Pineland helped to launch such persons into more useful and rewarding lives, but past events nonetheless had robbed them of the expression of much potential and left many with a crippling heritage.

Included in preventive work in the area at the beginning of the cycle would be the following: early and continuing academic and social education of the disadvantaged children in a community setting; intensified social work with the families involved through more directly relevant agencies and resources; complete reform of systems that permit multiple foster home placements, which in their passive way can do great damage to children; and extreme restraint in the placing of trainable and, particularly, educable and borderline children

2

at an early age in custodial institutions for long periods of time. Needless to say, where old custodial policies still survive, reform in institutions for the retarded is a vital goal; and institutional policy itself can, as it has in more recent years at Pineland, prevent the indiscriminate dumping of children into the institution by irresponsible agencies.

Preventive action in these and other fields would generate material benefits by avoiding the production of expensively maintained, long-term social outcasts, and by creating instead valuable and contributory citizens. The nonmaterial benefits of obviating human miseries of course cannot be assigned any monetary value.

REFERENCES

Baller, M.R. A study of the present social status of a group of adults who, when they were in elementary schools, were classified as mentally deficient. Genetic Psychol. Monogr. 18, 1936, 165-244.

Barrett, A.M., Relos, R. & Eisele, J. Vocational success and attitudes of mentally retarded toward work and money. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1965, 70, 102-108.

Charles, D.C. Ability and accomplishment of persons earlier judged mentally deficient. Genetic Psychol. Monogr. 47, 1953, 3-71.

Dingman, H.F., Eyman, R.K. & Tarjan, J. Mathematical analyses of hospital release data. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1965, 70, 223-231.

Edgerton, R. The cloak of competence. Berkeley, Calif.: U. of Calif. Press, 1967.

Goroff, N. Research and community placement - an exploratory approach. Mental Retardation (AAMD), 1967, 5, 17-19.

Hoffman, J.L. The location of missing subjects. Mental Retardation (AAMD), 1969, Vol 7, 3, 18-21.

Jackson, S.K. & Butler, A.J. Prediction of successful community placement of institutionalized retardates. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1963, 68, 211-217.

Kennedy, R.J.R. A Connecticut community revisited: A study of the social adjustment of a group of mentally deficient adults in 1948 and 1960. A report on Project No. 655 to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Dept. of H.E.W., Washington, D.C., Jan. 30, 1962.

Kolstoe, O.P. An examination of some characteristics which discriminate between employed and not employed mentally retarded males. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1961, 66, 472-482.

Kolstoe, O.P. & Shafter, A.J. Employability prediction for mentally retarded adults: a methodological note. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1961, 66, 287-289.

Krishef, C.H. The influence of rural-urban environment upon the adjustment of dischargees from the Owatonna State School. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1959, 63, 860-865.

Krishef, C.H., Reynolds, M.C. & Stunkard, C.L. A study of factors related to rating post-institutional adjustment. Minn. Welfare, 1959, 11, 5-15.

Kugel, R.B. & Parsons, M.H. Children of deprivation: changing the course of familial retardation. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, Dept. of H.E.W., 1967.

Macmillan, M.B. Adjustment and process: a neglected feature of follow-up studies of retarded people. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1962, 67, 418-423.

O'Connor, N. & Tizard, J. Predicting the occupational adequacy of certified mental defectives. Occup. Psychol., 1951, 25, 205-211.

O'Connor, N. & Tizard, J. The social problem of mental deficiency. London: Pergamon Press, 1956.

Reynolds, M.C. & MacEachern, D.G. The prediction of adult status of high grade mental defectives. In M.E. Wright & H.T. Croley (Eds.) Research in the management of the mentally retarded child. Winfield, Kansas: Winfield State Trng. Sch., 1956, Pp 175-193.

Reynolds, M.C. & Stunkard, C.L. A comparative study of day class vs. institutionalized educable retardates. Minneapolis, Minn.: College of Education, U. of Minnesota, 1960.

Sarason, S.B. & Gladwin, T. Psychological and cultural problems in mental subnormality: A review of research. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1958, 62, 1113-1307.

Shafter, A.J. Prediction of post-institutional vocational placement achievement. In M.E. Wright & H.T. Croley (Eds.) Research in the management of the mentally retarded child. Winfield, Kansas: Winfield State Trng. Sch., 1956, Pp 194-203.

Shafter, A.J. Criteria for selecting institutionalized mental defectives for vocational placement. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1957, 61, 599-616.

Song, A.Y. & Song, R.H. Prediction of job efficiency of institutionalized retardates in the community. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1969, 73, 567-571.

Windle, C.D. Prognosis of mental subnormals: a critical review of research. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1962, 66, Monograph Supplement.

Windle, C.D., Steward, E. & Brown, S.J. Reasons for community failure of released patients. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1961, 66, 213-217.

Zigler, E., Butterfield, E.C. & Goff, G. A measure of pre-institutional social deprivation for institutionalized retardates. Amer. J. Ment. Defic., 1966, 70, 873-885.

A - 1

TABLE OF REGRESSIONS AND SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

	MALES							FEMALES							
1 = Most Signif. 2 = Second Most 3 = Third Most x = Other	POLICE CONTACTS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES L vs U ½	WAGES L vs U 1/3	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES ALL L&U ½	WGS ALL L&U 1/3	WAGES SING L&U ½	WAGES MARR L&U ½	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS
1 BIRTHDATE												2			
2 Catholic															
3 Protestant															
4 Level Soc. Funct. Before PH															
5 PROPERTY DESTRUCT BEFORE PH											x		3		
6 PROPERTY THEFT BEFORE PH	x														
7 Affect re Mother: Good															
8 AFFECT RE MOTHER: AVERAGE										x					
9 AFFECT RE MOTHER: NEGATIVE										3					
10 Genl. Obedience Before PH															
11 Escapes Before PH															
12 Actual School Grades															
13 SOCIAL SCHOOL GRADES			2												
14 Pre-institutional IQ															
15 Lang. Spoken: English Only															
16 Lang.: French & Fr. Mix															
17 AGE M-R IDENTIFIED		x		1			1								
18 NEGATIVE SOCIAL HISTORY		2													
19 Home Struct. Birth: Both Pars.															
20 Home Str. Brth: Mother, Father															
21 HOME STR. 1 YR: BOTH PARENTS			x												
22 Home Str. 1 Yr: Mother, Father															
23 HOME STR. 1 YR: REL, FOSTER				x											
24 Home Str. Adm: Both Parents															
25 Home Str.Adm: Mo,Fa,Rels,Adopt															
26 Home Str.Adm:Fost,Corr'l,Other															
27 HOME STR.ADM: SOLO					x	x			2						
28 LEGITIMATE												3			
29 Parents Separated															
30 Total Number Sibs															
31 Pt. is Only Child															
32 FIRST BORN IN SIBSHIP	x														
33 2ND IN SIBSHIP											x				
34 Middle Posit. in Sibship															
35 Next-to-Last in Sibship															
36 LAST IN SIBSHIP		x													
37 Mother Yankee															
38 Mother French-Canadian															
39 FATHER YANKEE	x										1	x			
40 Father French-Canadian															
41 Mother U-M to Lower Class															
42 Mother Rural-Village															
43 MOTHER TOWN-URBAN										x					

TABLE OF REGRESSIONS AND SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES - CONTINUED

	MALES							FEMALES							
	POLICE CONTACTS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES L vs U ½	WAGES L vs U 1/3	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES ALL L&U ½	WGS ALL L&U 1/3	WAGES SING L&U ½	WAGES MARR L&U ½	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS
44 FATHER U-M TO LOWER CLASS															X
45 FATHER RURAL-VILLAGE									3						
46 FATHER TOWN-URBAN	x														
47 Mother 0-4th Grade Educ.															
48 MO. 4-8 GR. TO HS INCOMPL.	x														
49 Mo. HS Compl to Coll Compl.															
50 Father 0-4th Grade Educ.															
51 Fa. 4-8 Gr. to HS Incompl.															
52 Fa. HS Compl to Prof. Compl.															
53 Accept-Reject by Mother															
54 ACCEPT REJECT BY FATHER		3													
55 Mother's Psych. Health															
56 Father's Psych. Health															
57 Mother's Instit. History															
58 Father's Instit. History															
59 Instit. Hist. Other Relatives															
60 TYPE ADM: PROBATE, VOLUNT.					3	2									
61 T. Admiss: Corr, Super, Municl															
62 INITIT. ADM: MOTHER & FATHER		x													
63 INIT. ADM: MO, FA, OTHER KIN											x				
64 INIT. ADM: FOS,H&W,CIVIL,TOWN					x	x									
65 Init.Adm:Courts,Police,Law,etc															
66 INIT.ADM: ORPH,MENTAL,CORR,MR										x	x				
67 Age Admitted to PH															
68 AGE DISCHARGED FROM PH				x							2				
69 YEAR OF DISCHARGE			1	x				x	1	1	3	1			
70 Actual Stay, in Years, at PH															
71 LEGAL STAY, IN YEARS, AT PH	2														
72 IQ on Admission															
73 IQ ON DISCHARGE				2											
74 Max. Recorded IQ															
75 Min.Recorded IQ															
76 MENTAL LEVEL ON ADMISSION				x		x									
77 Mental Level on Discharge															
78 EMOTIONAL STABILITY	3				1										
79 PSYCH. DIAG: NIL, OR GOOD				3											
80 Psych.Diag: persnl, Chrctlgcl															
81 Psych.Diag: Mental Disorder															
82 GENERAL HEALTH														x	3
83 PHYSICAL ILLNESS								x							
84 GENL. PHYSICAL HANDICAP															1
85 Speech Handicap															
86 SUBPRIMARY-2ND GR. AT PH		x			2										

TABLE OF REGRESSION AND SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES - CONTINUED

	MALES							FEMALES							
	POLICE CONTACTS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES L vs U ½	WAGES L vs U 1/3	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS	SELF SUPPORT	WAGES ALL L&U ½	WGS ALL L&U 1/3	WAGES SING L&U ½	WAGES MARR L&U ½	DOMS 1-3 vs 4+	DOMS 2-3 vs 4+	MARITAL STATUS
87 3RD-8TH GR. AT PH			3												
88 Special Class at PH															
89 Manual Training															
90 OTHER TRAINING TYPES												x			
91 O. TRAINING TYPES, ADD'L								x			x				
92 EUGENIC STERILIZATION								1		2					
93 LEVEL OF SOC. FUNCT. AT PH							3								
94 ATTITUDE RE ACAD TASKS: GOOD		x													
95 Att. re Acad.Tasks: Avge-Poor															
96 ATT. RE VOC. TASKS: GOOD												x			
97 ATT. RE VOC TASKS: AVGE-POOR				x	x	3	x								
98 PROPERTY DESTRUCT AT PH								2							
99 Property Theft at PH															
100 Affect re Teachers, etc.															
101 AFFECT RE PEERS, ETC.						1							1	1	
102 HETEROSEXUAL ACTING OUT														3	2
103 Homosexual Acting Out															
104 Genl. Obedience at PH															
105 NUMBER OF ESCAPES	1		x		x										
106 No. of Rels. Asking Disch.															
107 No. Visits to Hosp. by Rels.															
108 NUMBER OF HOME VISITS								3							
109 Clothing: State vs Home															
110 BOARD PAYMENTS: STATE vs HOME											x				
111 PT'S WISH FOR RELEASE			x								x				
112 TRIAL VISITS: NONE				x			x								
113 TRIAL VISITS: 1-3							2								
114 TRIAL VISITS: 4-10				x											
115 Discharged to: Self Outright															
116 Disch to: Self(Modif),rel,par.															
117 Disch to:Corrctl & O. Instit															
118 CONDTN OF DISCH: SELF-SUPPORT		1											2	2	
119 Improved at Discharge															
120 NOT IMPROVED AT DISCHARGE							x								
121 Struct Changes: Birth-1 Yr.															
122 Str Changes: Age 1-4 Yrs.															
123 Str Changes: Age 5-9 Yrs.															
124 STR CHANGES: AGE 10-14 YRS.				x											
125 Str Changes: Age 15-19 Yrs.															
126 Total Changes: Age 0-19 Yrs.															

APPENDIX B

INDEX TO
MULTILINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSES
DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES

			Mlt.Regr. PAGE	Dis.Funct. PAGE
POLICE CONTACTS				
	Males	No Contacts vs Any Contacts	B-1	B-2, 3
		No Cont. vs Cont. + No Jail vs Cont. + Jail		B-4, 5
	Females	(Too few contacts for statistical analysis)		
SELF SUPPORT				
	Males	Full Self Support vs Partial & None	B-6	B-7, 8
	Females	Full Self Support vs Partial & None	B-9	B-10, 11
WAGE LEVELS				
	Males	Lower Half vs Upper Half	B-12	B-14, 15
		Lower Third vs Upper Third	B-13	
		Lower Third vs Middle Third vs Upper Third		B-16, 17
	Females			
	All	Lower Half vs Upper Half	B-18	
		Lower Third vs Upper Third	B-19	
		1/3 vs 3/6 vs 4/6 vs 3/3		B-22, 23
		1/3 vs 2/3 vs 3/3		B-24, 25
		Sing 1/3 vs Mar 1/3 vs Sing 3/3 vs Mar 3/3		B-30,-32
	Single	Lower Half vs Upper Half	B-20	
		Lower Third vs Upper Third		B-26, 27
	Married	Lower Half vs Upper Half	B-21	
		Lower Third vs Upper Third		B-28, 29
PERS. DOMICILES				
	Males	1-3 vs 4-plus	B-33	B-35, 36
		2-3 vs 4-plus	B-34	
		1 vs 2-3 vs 4-plus		B-37, 38
	Females	1-3 vs 4-plus	B-39	B-41, 42
		2-3 vs 4-plus	B-40	
		1 vs 2-3 vs 4-plus		B-43, 44
MARITAL				
	Males	Married vs Single	B-45	
	Females	Married vs Single	B-46	B-47, 48

MALES - POLICE CONTACTS - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

No Police Contacts vs Some Police Contacts

No. of Observations 231
Step No. 8

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
105	-0.095	0.020	4.79	1%	32.05	0.1%
71	0.002	0.001	2.83	1%	21.40	0.1%
78	-0.119	0.051	2.32	5%	8.48	0.5%
39	-0.255	0.077	3.33	1%	6.96	1.0%
46	-0.207	0.071	2.90	1%	8.89	0.5%
6	-0.067	0.028	2.40	2%	6.78	2.5%
48	-0.163	0.068	2.40	2%	4.56	5.0%
32	0.247	0.113	2.19	5%	4.78	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.713 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.821 R SQUARE: 0.328

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	NO POLICE CONTACTS	ANY POLICE CONTACTS
105	Few, No Escapes at PH	Numerous Escapes at PH
71	Longer Legal Stay at PH	Shorter Legal Stay at PH
78	Good Emotional Stability at PH	Poor Emotional Stability at PH
39	Father: Not Yankee	Father: Yankee
46	Father: Not Town-Urban	Father: Town-Urban
6	No Property Theft before PH	Property Theft before PH
48	Mo.: Not 4-8 Gr. thru HS Incompl.	Mother: 4-8 Gr. thru HS Incompl.
32	Pt. First Born (Not Only Child)	Pt. Not First Born

MALES - POLICE CONTACTS - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (137): No Police Contacts
Group II (94): Any Police Contacts
Total: 231

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
105	Number of Escapes at PH
71	Legal Stay in Number of Years at PH
78	Emotional Stability at PH
39	Father's Ethnicity: Yankee
46	Father's Original Residence: Town or Urban
6	Property Theft before PH
48	Mother's Education: 4-8 Gr. thru H.S. Incomplete
32	Birth Order in Sibship: First (Not Only)

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
105	1.961	1.124	3.181
71	123.922	145.774	92.074
78	2.126	1.825	2.564
39	0.554	0.504	0.628
46	0.061	-0.051	0.223
6	1.913	1.336	2.755
48	0.294	0.139	0.521
32	0.121	0.175	0.043

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
105	-0.110	0.182
71	0.020	0.015
78	1.685	2.050
39	0.980	1.761
46	0.325	0.957
6	0.505	0.711
48	0.162	0.661
32	0.974	0.219
Constant:	-3.624	-5.422

Mahalanobis D Square: 111.892 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	110	27
Discrim. Funct. II:	23	71

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	82.70%	59.30%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	72.44%	40.69%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	80.29%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	75.53%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	78.35%	50.00%

MALES - POLICE CONTACTS - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (137):	No Police Contacts
Group II (35):	Police Contacts, No Jailing
Group III (59):	Police Contacts, Any Jailing
Total:	231

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
105	Number of Escapes at PH
71	Legal Stay in Number of Years at PH
78	Emotional Stability at PH
39	Father's Ethnicity: Yankee
46	Father's Original Residence: Town or Urban
6	Property Theft before PH
48	Mother's Education: 4-8 Gr. thru H.S. Incomplete
32	Birth Order in Sibship: First (Not Only)

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS
105	1.961	1.124	2.029	3.864
71	123.922	145.774	121.229	74.780
78	2.126	1.825	1.886	2.966
39	0.554	0.504	0.686	0.593
46	0.061	-0.051	0.400	0.119
6	1.913	1.336	2.343	3.000
48	0.294	0.139	0.514	0.525
32	0.121	0.175	-0.029	0.085

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. III COEFFICIENT
105	-0.088	0.075	0.314
71	0.020	0.018	0.011
78	1.760	1.640	2.545
39	0.980	1.733	1.779
46	0.277	1.182	0.665
6	0.501	0.720	0.693
48	0.142	0.752	0.541
32	1.028	-0.066	0.576
Constant:	-3.659	-4.560	-6.581

Mahalanobis D Square 159.189 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III
Discrim. Funct. I:	98	28	11
Discrim. Funct. II:	7	23	5
Discrim. Funct. III:	11	14	34

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	84.48%	59.37%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	35.38%	15.10%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	68.00%	25.52%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	71.53%	33.33%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	65.71%	33.33%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	57.62%	33.33%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	67.09%	33.33%

MALES - SELF-SUPPORT - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Full Self-Support vs Partial & No Self-Support

No. of Observations 206
Step No. 8

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
118	0.250	0.065	3.83	1%	19.69	0.1%
18	-0.173	0.040	4.38	1%	16.92	0.1%
54	0.111	0.050	2.21	5%	9.30	0.5%
17	0.124	0.042	2.92	1%	7.15	1.0%
36	-0.370	0.122	3.04	1%	8.75	0.5%
86	-0.362	0.100	3.61	1%	6.07	2.5%
94	0.216	0.091	2.37	2%	5.50	2.5%
62	-0.637	0.270	2.35	2%	5.54	2.5%

PURE CONSTANT: -0.382 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.835 R SQUARE: 0.316

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	FULL SELF SUPPORT	PARTIAL AND NO SELF SUPPORT
118	Self Supporting at Discharge	Not Self Supporting at Discharge
18	No Negat. Social Hist. before PH	Negative Social History before PH
54	Paternal Rejection, etc.	No Paternal Rejection, etc.
17	M-R Identified When Pt. Older	M-R Identified When Pt. Younger
36	Not Last in Sibship	Last in Sibship
86	Not Subprim. to 2nd Gr. at PH	Subprim. to 2nd Gr. at PH
94	Good Attitude re Acad. Tasks at PH	Not Good Att. re Acad. Tasks at PH
62	Init. Admiss: Not Mother & Father	Initiators: Admiss: Mother & Father

MALES - SELF-SUPPORT - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (119):	Full Self-Support
Group II (87):	Partial & No Self-Support
Total:	206

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
118	Condition of Discharge: Self-Support
18	Negative Social History before PH
54	Paternal Acceptance-Rejection
17	Age When Retardation Identified
36	Birth Order in Sibship: Last
86	Highest Acad. Grade at PH: Subprim. thru 2nd Gr.
94	Attitude Toward PH Academic Tasks: Good
62	Initiators of Admission: Mother and Father

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
118	0.379	0.613	0.057
18	1.951	1.588	2.448
54	3.762	3.992	3.448
17	3.553	3.740	3.299
36	0.165	0.092	0.264
86	-0.078	-0.126	-0.011
94	-0.073	0.042	-0.230
62	0.044	0.000	0.103

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
118	1.149	0.406
18	0.347	0.861
54	3.107	2.777
17	1.810	1.443
36	0.353	1.451
86	-0.709	0.366
94	-0.636	-1.276
62	2.748	4.638
Constant:	-10.262	-8.811
Mahalanobis D Square	94.365	Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	92	27
Discrim. Funct. II:	25	62

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	78.63%	57.76%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	69.66%	42.23%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	77.31%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	71.26%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	74.75%	50.00%

FEMALES - SELF-SUPPORT - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Full Self-Support vs Partial & No Self-Support

No. of Observations 167
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
92	0.527	0.153	3.45	1%	13.70	0.1%
98	-0.284	0.093	3.04	1%	10.05	0.5%
108	-0.098	0.044	2.23	5%	6.33	2.5%
83	0.164	0.069	2.38	2%	4.58	5.0%
91	0.008	0.003	2.66	1%	5.04	5.0%
69	-0.074	0.030	2.46	2%	6.04	2.5%

PURE CONSTANT: 4.391 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.874 R SQUARE: 0.239

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	FULL SELF SUPPORT	PARTIAL OR NO SELF SUPPORT
92	Eugenic Sterilization	No Eugenic Sterilization
98	No Property Destruct. at PH	Property Destruction at PH
108	Few or No Home Visits	More Home Visits
83	No Physical Illness at PH	Physical Illnesses at PH
91	Other Training Types Add'l at PH	No Other Training Types at PH
69	Earlier Year of Discharge	Later Year of Discharge

FEMALES - SELF-SUPPORT - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (100): Full Self-Support
Group II (67): Partial & No Self-Support
Total: 167

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
92	Eugenic Sterilization
98	Property Destruction at PH
108	Number of Home Visits
83	Physical Illness at PH
91	Other Training Types at PH
69	Year of Discharge

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
92	0.287	0.390	0.134
98	0.198	0.040	0.433
108	1.916	1.660	2.299
83	0.138	0.220	0.015
91	19.335	22.130	15.164
69	57.856	57.410	58.522

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
92	7.792	6.367
98	-1.727	-0.960
108	-0.905	-0.641
83	-0.513	-0.956
91	-0.162	-0.183
69	11.531	11.730
Constant:	-329.872	-341.332

Mahalanobis D Square 51.823 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	73	27
Discrim. Funct. II:	19	48

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	79.34%	59.88%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	64.00%	40.11%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	73.00%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	71.64%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	72.45%	50.00%

MALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Half vs Upper One Half

No. of Observations 213
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
69	0.146	0.025	5.79	1%	21.67	0.1%
13	-0.060	0.024	2.48	2%	7.82	1.0%
87	-0.213	0.073	2.91	1%	7.07	1.0%
105	0.080	0.027	2.98	1%	5.34	2.5%
111	-0.212	0.075	2.85	1%	7.88	1.0%
21	-0.233	0.104	2.23	5%	4.96	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -7.946 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.895 R SQUARE: 0.225

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
13	Lower Soc. School Grades before PH	Higher Soc. Sch. Grades before PH
87	Not 3rd - 8th Grades at PH	3rd - 8th Grades at PH
105	Few, No Escapes at PH	Numerous Escapes at PH
111	No Release Wish Recorded	Release Wish
21	Home Struct. 1 Yr: Not Both Pars.	Home Struct. 1 Yr: Both Parents

MALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Third vs Upper One Third

No. of Observations 142
Step No. 11

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
17	-0.113	0.048	2.37	2%	15.29	0.1%
73	-0.022	0.006	3.93	1%	11.21	0.1%
79	-0.303	0.154	1.97	5%	9.53	0.5%
68	0.029	0.007	4.04	1%	10.43	0.5%
23	-0.598	0.182	3.28	1%	5.62	2.5%
97	0.285	0.091	3.15	1%	6.60	2.5%
76	-0.015	0.006	2.44	2%	4.80	5.0%
124	-0.183	0.068	3.71	1%	4.71	5.0%
69	0.083	0.030	2.77	1%	4.75	5.0%
114	-0.391	0.158	2.48	2%	4.77	5.0%
112	0.300	0.139	2.16	5%	4.65	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -3.004   ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.780   R SQUARE: 0.443

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER ONE THIRD	UPPER ONE THIRD
17	M-R Identified When Pt. Younger	M-R Identified When Pt. Older
73	Lower I.Q. on Discharge	Higher I.Q. on Discharge
79	Psych. Diag.: Not Good (Or Absent)	Psychol. Diagnos.: Good (Or Absent)
68	Older on Discharge	Younger on Discharge
23	Home Struct. 1 Yr: Not Rels, Foster	Home Struct. 1 Yr: Rels, Foster
97	Avge-Poor Attit. re Voc. Tasks at PH	Not Av-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks
76	Higher Mental Level on Entry to PH	Lower Mental Level on Entry to PH
124	Few Struct. Changes Age 10 - 14	More Struct. Changes Age 10 - 14
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
114	Not 4 - 10 Trial Visits	4 - 10 Trial Visits
112	Zero Trial Visits	Not Zero Trial Visits

MALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (106): Lower One Half
Group II (107): Upper One Half
Total: 213

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
69	Year of Discharge
13	Social School Grades before PH
87	Highest Acad. Grade at PH: 3rd thru 8th Gr.
105	Number of Escapes at PH
111	Patient's Wish for Discharge
21	Home Structure at 1 Year: Both Parents
17	Age When Retardation Identified
73	IQ on Discharge
79	Psychol. Diagnosis at PH: No Comment, or Good
68	Age Discharged from PH
23	Home Structure at 1 Year: Relatives, Foster
97	Attitude Toward PH Vocat. Tasks: Avge. thru Poor
76	Mental Level on Admission
124	Home Structural Changes: Age 10 - 14 Years
114	Number of Trial Visits: 4 - 20
112	Number of Trial Visits: None

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
69	57.728	58.472	56.991
13	4.869	4.557	5.178
87	0.197	0.047	0.346
105	1.545	1.840	1.252
111	0.521	0.396	0.645
21	0.723	0.670	0.776
17	3.535	3.274	3.794
73	68.920	65.925	71.888
79	0.765	0.698	0.832
68	27.742	29.387	26.112
23	-0.023	-0.057	0.009
97	0.160	0.217	0.103
76	28.897	29.104	28.692
124	0.808	0.726	0.888
114	0.141	0.142	0.140
112	0.282	0.264	0.299

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
69	14.731	14.395
13	-2.667	-2.580
87	-4.721	-4.344
105	0.689	0.478
111	-4.912	-4.274
21	-4.498	-4.223
17	4.255	4.374
73	1.228	1.252
79	18.414	19.023
68	0.645	0.619
23	1.244	2.065
97	3.437	3.137
76	0.150	0.162
124	-1.856	-1.718
114	-15.492	-14.854
112	15.646	15.410
Constant:	-488.799	-472.321
Mahalanobis D Square	76.943	Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	75	31
Discrim. Funct. II:	28	79

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	72.81%	49.76%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	71.81%	50.23%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	70.75%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	73.83%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	72.30%	50.00%

MALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (71): Lower One Third
Group II (71): Middle One Third
Group III (71): Upper One Third
Total: 213

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
17	Age When Retardation Identified
73	IQ on Discharge
79	Psychol. Diagnosis at PH: No Comment, or Good
68	Age Discharged from PH
23	Home Structure at 1 Year: Relatives, Foster
97	Attitude Toward PH Vocat. Tasks: Avge. thru Poor
76	Mental Level on Admission
124	Home Structural Changes: Age 10 - 14 Years
69	Year of Discharge
114	Number of Trial Visits: 4 - 20
112	Number of Trial Visits: None

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS
17	3.535	3.042	3.592	3.972
73	68.920	64.634	69.239	72.887
79	0.765	0.634	0.831	0.831
68	27.742	30.310	28.690	24.225
23	-0.023	-0.085	-0.028	0.042
97	0.160	0.282	0.225	-0.028
76	28.897	27.958	30.958	27.775
124	0.808	0.606	0.789	1.028
69	57.728	58.563	57.479	57.141
114	0.141	0.127	0.141	0.155
112	0.282	0.282	0.282	0.282

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. III COEFFICIENT
17	2.997	3.273	3.381
73	1.049	1.082	1.104
79	17.278	18.320	18.377
68	0.811	0.783	0.735
23	-2.406	-1.342	-0.456
97	3.983	3.736	3.156
76	0.073	0.117	0.112
124	-2.902	-2.693	-2.459
69	13.104	12.925	12.832
114	-16.453	-15.831	-15.311
112	17.269	16.922	16.302
Constant:	-442.136	-436.094	-431.468

Mahalanobis D Square 100.719 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III
Discrim. Funct. I:	47	15	9
Discrim. Funct. II:	26	25	20
Discrim. Funct. III:	7	16	48

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	58.75%	33.33%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	44.64%	33.33%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	62.33%	33.33%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	66.19%	33.33%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	35.21%	33.33%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	67.60%	33.33%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	56.33%	33.33%

ALL FEMALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Half vs Upper One Half

No. of Observations 170
Step No. 3

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
69	0.181	0.029	2.77	1%	35.18	0.1%
27	-0.887	0.371	2.39	2%	6.45	2.5%
45	-0.180	0.080	2.24	5%	5.00	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -10.437 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.890 R SQUARE: 0.227

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
27	Home Struct. on Admiss.: Not Solo	Home Struct. on Admiss.: Solo
45	Father: Not Rural-Village	Father: Rural-Village

ALL FEMALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Third vs Upper One Third

No. of Observations 112
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
69	0.244	0.036	6.80	1%	30.66	0.1%
92	-0.605	0.181	3.35	1%	5.86	2.5%
9	-0.708	0.186	3.81	1%	4.91	5.0%
8	0.500	0.175	2.85	1%	7.05	2.5%
66	0.435	0.175	2.50	2%	4.39	5.0%
43	-0.238	0.118	2.01	5%	4.05	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -14.161 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.810 R SQUARE: 0.384

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER ONE THIRD	UPPER ONE THIRD
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
92	No Eugenic Sterilization	Eugenic Sterilization
9	Not Negative Affect re Mother	Negative Affect re Mother
8	Avge Affect re Mother	Not Avge Affect re Mother
66	Init. Admiss.: Orph, Mental, MR	Init. Admiss.: Not Orph, Mental, MR
43	Mother: Not Town-Urban	Mother: Town-Urban

SINGLE FEMALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Half vs Upper One Half

No. of Observations 82
Step No. 10

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
39	-0.485	0.126	3.85	1%	11.25	0.5%
68	0.030	0.008	3.80	1%	8.51	0.5%
69	0.165	0.036	4.57	1%	8.79	0.5%
110	-0.381	0.081	4.74	1%	7.01	2.5%
63	1.341	0.303	4.43	1%	9.28	0.5%
33	-0.565	0.182	3.11	1%	8.55	0.5%
5	0.210	0.066	3.17	1%	6.96	2.5%
111	-0.294	0.103	2.86	1%	4.65	5.0%
66	0.416	0.179	2.33	5%	4.86	5.0%
91	-0.008	0.003	2.24	5%	4.98	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -9.845 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.673 R SQUARE: 0.608

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF
39	Father: Not Yankee	Father: Yankee
68	Older on Discharge	Younger on Discharge
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
110	Board Payments by State	Board Payments by Home
63	Init. Admiss: Mo, Fa, Kin	Init. Admiss: Not Mo, Fa, Kin
33	Pt. Not Second in Sibship	Pt. Second in Sibship
5	Property Destruct before PH	No Property Destruct. before PH
111	No Release Wish Recorded	Release Wish
66	Init. Admiss: Orph, Mental, MR	Init. Admiss: Not Orph, Mental, MR
91	No Other Training Types Add'l at PH	Other Training Types Add'l at PH

MARRIED FEMALES - WAGES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Lower One Half vs Upper One Half

No. of Observations 88
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
69	0.177	0.039	4.60	1%	27.27	0.1%
1	0.033	0.009	3.75	1%	9.19	0.5%
28	-0.284	0.115	2.48	2%	8.64	0.5%
90	0.011	0.004	2.65	1%	6.72	2.5%
39	0.434	0.159	2.72	1%	6.24	2.5%
96	0.241	0.112	2.16	5%	4.68	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: 41.336 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.741 R SQUARE: 0.495

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF
69	Later Year of Discharge	Earlier Year of Discharge
1	Later Birthdate	Earlier Birthdate
28	Illegitimate	Legitimate
90	Other Training Types at PH	No Other Training Types at PH
39	Father: Yankee	Father: Not Yankee
96	Good Attitude re Voc. Tasks at PH	Not Good Att. re Voc. Tasks at PH

ALL FEMALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (56):	Lower One Third
Group II (29):	One Third - One Half
Group III (29):	One Half - Two Thirds
Group IV (56):	Upper One Third
Total:	170

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
69	Year of Discharge
27	Home Structure on Admission: Solo Types
45	Father's Original Residence: Rural or Village
92	Eugenic Sterilization
9	Affect Toward Mother: Negative
8	Affect Toward Mother: Average
66	Initiators of Admiss.: Orph., Mental, Corr., M-R
43	Mother's Original Residence: Town or Urban

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS	GROUP IV MEANS
69	57.971	58.750	59.310	57.724	56.625
27	0.035	0.000	0.000	0.069	0.071
45	0.171	0.018	0.138	0.276	0.286
92	0.265	0.161	0.241	0.310	0.357
9	-0.382	-0.536	-0.310	-0.310	-0.304
8	-0.376	-0.464	-0.310	-0.414	-0.304
66	0.359	0.357	0.483	0.448	0.250
43	0.065	0.036	0.103	0.138	0.036

VARIABLE	DISCR. FN. I COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. II COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. III COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. IV COEFFICIENT
69	16.541	16.668	16.161	15.896
27	4.498	4.347	6.200	6.243
45	-4.889	-4.800	-4.493	-4.394
92	-1.130	-0.731	-0.130	0.037
9	-20.114	-19.699	-18.849	-18.812
8	22.317	22.314	21.144	21.263
66	7.151	7.633	7.362	6.384
43	-13.528	-13.515	-13.015	-12.943
Constant:	-487.011	-494.620	-465.312	-449.837

Mahalanobis D Square 86.403 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III	EVALUATED AS GROUP IV
Discr. Funct. I:	26	17	4	9
Discr. Funct. II:	6	16	3	4
Discr. Funct. III:	8	7	4	10
Discr. Funct. IV:	9	2	9	36

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	53.06%	32.94%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	38.09%	17.05%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	20.00%	17.05%
% of All 4's Correctly Identified:	61.01%	32.94%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	46.42%	25.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	55.17%	25.00%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	13.79%	25.00%
% of Group IV Correctly Identified:	64.28%	25.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	48.23%	25.00%

Lower One Half Income vs Upper One Half Income

% of All 1's & 2's Correctly Identified:	71.42%	50.00%
% of All 3's & 4's Correctly Identified:	74.68%	50.00%
% of Group I & II Correctly Identified:	76.47%	50.00%
% of Group III & IV Correctly Identified:	69.41%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	72.94%	50.00%

ALL FEMALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (56):	Lower One Third
Group II (58):	Middle One Third
Group III (56):	Upper One Third
Total:	170

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
69	Year of Discharge
27	Home Structure on Admission: Solo Types
45	Father's Original Residence: Rural or Village
92	Eugenic Sterilization
9	Affect Toward Mother: Negative
8	Affect Toward Mother: Average
66	Initiators of Admiss.: Orph., Mental, Corr., M-R
43	Mother's Original Residence: Town or Urban

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS
69	57.971	58.750	58.517	56.625
27	0.035	0.000	0.034	0.071
45	0.171	0.018	0.207	0.286
92	0.265	0.161	0.276	0.357
9	-0.382	-0.536	-0.310	-0.304
8	-0.376	-0.464	-0.363	-0.304
66	0.359	0.357	0.466	0.250
43	0.065	0.036	0.121	0.036

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. III COEFFICIENT
69	15.439	15.327	14.848
27	8.915	9.637	10.456
45	-4.193	-3.958	-3.730
92	0.287	0.972	1.392
9	-18.222	-17.403	-17.010
8	19.679	19.124	18.754
66	6.551	6.908	5.811
43	-12.423	-12.175	-11.893
Constant:	-454.763	-448.457	-420.716

Mahalanobis D Square 64.919 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III
Discrim. Funct. I:	34	13	9
Discrim. Funct. II:	23	20	15
Discrim. Funct. III:	9	10	37

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	51.51%	32.93%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	46.51%	34.12%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	60.65%	32.93%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	60.71%	33.33%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	34.48%	33.33%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	66.07%	33.33%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	53.52%	33.33%

SINGLE FEMALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (27): Lower One Third
Group II (27): Upper One Third
Total: 54

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
39	Father's Ethnicity: Yankee
68	Age Discharged from PH
69	Year of Discharge
110	Board Payments: State vs Home
63	Initiators of Admission: Mother; Father; O. Kin
33	Birth Order in Sibship: Second
5	Property Destruction before PH
111	Patient's Wish for Discharge
66	Initiators of Admiss: Orph., Mental, Corr., M-R
91	Other Training Types, Additional, at PH

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
39	0.630	0.481	0.778
68	36.315	40.037	32.593
69	57.907	59.037	59.778
110	1.222	1.222	1.222
63	0.093	0.148	0.037
33	0.130	0.000	0.259
5	0.574	0.852	0.296
111	0.667	0.630	0.704
66	0.296	0.481	0.111
91	23.204	25.963	20.444

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
39	-12.471	-10.711
68	1.480	1.306
69	23.761	22.414
110	-21.955	-19.510
63	31.769	22.964
33	-39.379	-34.552
5	6.231	4.810
111	-9.588	-8.328
66	6.830	2.964
91	-0.732	-0.675
Constant:	-708.723	-628.473

Mahalanobis D Square 122.780 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	24	3
Discrim. Funct. II:	2	25

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	92.30%	50.00%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	89.28%	50.00%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	88.88%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	92.59%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	90.74%	50.00%

MARRIED FEMALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (29): Lower One Third
Group II (29): Upper One Third
Total: 58

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
69	Year of Discharge
1	Year of Birth
28	Legitimate-Illegitimate
39	Father's Ethnicity: Yankee
96	Attitude Toward PH Vocational Tasks: Good

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
69	57.483	58.483	56.483
1	926.500	930.172	922.827
28	0.724	0.586	0.862
39	0.690	0.828	0.552
96	0.241	0.207	0.276

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
69	-0.852	-1.422
1	13.792	13.708
28	3.243	4.035
39	55.528	54.169
96	26.258	25.502
Constant:	-6416.367	-6305.305

Mahalanobis D Square 33.301 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	23	6
Discrim. Funct. II:	9	20

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	71.87%	50.00%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	76.92%	50.00%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	79.31%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	68.96%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	74.13%	50.00%

ALL FEMALES - WAGES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (27):	Single - Lower One Third
Group II (29):	Married - Lower One Third
Group III (27):	Single - Upper One Third
Group IV (29):	Married - Upper One Third
Total:	112

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
39	Father's Ethnicity: Yankee
68	Age Discharged from PH
69	Year of Discharge
110	Board Payments: State vs Home
63	Initiators of Admission: Mother; Father; O. Kin
33	Birth Order in Sibship: Second
5	Property Destruction before PH
111	Patient's Wish for Discharge
66	Initiators of Admiss.: Orph., Mental, Corr., M-R
91	Other Training Types, Additional, at PH
1	Year of Birth
28	Legitimate-Illegitimate
96	Attitude Toward PH Vocational Tasks: Good

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS	GROUP IV MEANS
39	0.661	0.481	0.828	0.778	0.552
68	33.330	40.037	27.931	32.593	33.172
69	57.687	59.037	58.483	56.778	56.483
110	1.223	1.222	1.207	1.222	1.241
63	0.089	0.148	0.069	0.037	0.103
33	0.089	0.000	0.138	0.259	-0.034
5	0.527	0.852	0.621	0.296	0.345
111	0.732	0.630	0.724	0.704	0.862
66	0.304	0.481	0.241	0.111	0.379
91	20.518	25.963	20.724	20.444	15.310
1	923.945	918.518	930.172	923.889	922.827
28	0.750	0.926	0.586	0.630	0.862
96	0.286	0.333	0.207	0.333	0.276

VARIABLE	DISCR. FN. I COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. II COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. III COEFFICIENT	DISCR. FN. IV COEFFICIENT
39	-45.105	-43.302	-43.815	-44.275
68	4255.109	4255.805	4255.820	4254.602
69	-4176.652	-4178.043	-4178.539	-4177.246
110	200.630	201.852	202.408	201.749
63	109.397	104.483	102.125	105.330
33	884.734	885.890	887.280	885.374
5	195.369	195.033	194.628	194.751
111	-347.820	-347.059	-346.919	-346.774
66	9.362	8.625	7.149	8.691
91	16.915	16.955	16.956	16.935
1	4311.617	4312.559	4312.508	4311.254
28	495.375	495.088	495.444	495.559
96	-33.624	-33.766	-33.799	-34.033
Constant:	-1942579.000	-1943395.000	-1943323.000	-1942192.000

Mahalanobis D Square 147.441 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III	EVALUATED AS GROUP IV
Discr. Funct. I:	19	0	0	8
Discr. Funct. II:	2	5	0	22
Discr. Funct. III:	2	2	0	23
Discr. Funct. IV:	3	0	0	26

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	73.07%	24.10%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	71.42%	25.89%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	0.00%	24.10%
% of All 4's Correctly Identified:	32.91%	25.89%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	70.37%	25.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	17.24%	25.00%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	0.00%	25.00%
% of Group IV Correctly Identified:	89.65%	25.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	44.64%	25.00%

Lower 1/3 Income vs Upper 1/3 Income

% of All 1's & 2's Correctly Identified:	78.78%	50.00%
% of All 3's & 4's Correctly Identified:	62.02%	50.00%
% of Group I & II Correctly Identified:	46.42%	50.00%
% of Group III & IV Correctly Identified:	87.50%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	66.96%	50.00%

MALES - PERS. DOMICILES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

1 - 3 Personnel Domiciles vs 4 or More Pers. Domiciles

No. of Observations 229
Step No. 7

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
78	-0.143	0.057	2.52	2%	11.59	0.1%
86	-0.190	0.088	2.16	5%	7.79	1.0%
60	0.420	0.126	3.34	1%	5.44	2.5%
64	-0.373	0.127	2.93	1%	8.31	0.5%
97	-0.181	0.080	2.28	5%	4.71	5.0%
27	1.182	0.527	2.24	5%	4.06	5.0%
105	-0.047	0.022	2.16	5%	4.67	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.572 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.894 R SQUARE: 0.184

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	1 TO 3 DOMICILES	4 OR MORE DOMICILES
78	Good Emotional Stability at PH	Poor Emotional Stability at PH
86	Not Subprimary to 2nd Gr. at PH	Subprimary to 2nd Gr. at PH
60	Probate, Voluntary Admiss. to PH	Not Probate, Voluntary Admiss. to PH
64	Init. Admiss.: Not Fos. Home, etc.	Init. Admiss.: Fos. Home, etc.
97	Not Avge-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks	Avge-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks at PH
27	Home Structure on Admiss.: Solo	Home Struct. on Admiss.: Not Solo
105	Few, No Escapes from PH	Numerous Escapes from PH

MALES - PERS. DOMICILES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

2 - 3 Personnel Domiciles vs 4 or More Pers. Domiciles

No. of Observations 199
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
101	-0.131	0.047	2.80	1%	9.77	0.1%
60	0.524	0.134	3.92	1%	7.95	1.0%
97	-0.231	0.084	2.75	1%	6.21	2.5%
64	-0.347	0.135	2.56	1%	5.51	2.5%
76	-0.014	0.006	2.33	5%	5.11	2.5%
27	1.238	0.533	2.32	5%	5.39	2.5%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.629 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.914 R SQUARE: 0.182

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	2 AND 3 DOMICILES	4 OR MORE DOMICILES
101	Good Affect re Peers at PH	Poor Affect re Peers at PH
60	Probate, Voluntary Admiss. to PH	Not Probate, Voluntary Admiss. to PH
97	Not Avge-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks	Avge-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks at PH
64	Init. Admiss: Not Fos. Home, etc.	Init. Admiss: Fos. Home, etc.
76	Higher Mental Level on Entry to PH	Lower Mental Level on Entry to PH
27	Home Struct. on Admiss: Solo	Home Struct. on Admiss: Not Solo

MALES - PERSONNEL DOMICILES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (141):	1 - 3 Personnel Domiciles
Group II (88):	4 or More Pers. Domiciles
Total:	229

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
78	Emotional Stability at PH
86	Highest Acad. Grade at PH: Subprim. thru 2nd Gr.
60	Type of Admission: Voluntary or Probate
64	Initiators of Admiss.: Foster, H & W, Civil, Town
97	Attitude Toward PH Vocat. Tasks: Avge. thru Poor
27	Home Structure on Admission: Solo Types
105	Number of Escapes at PH

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
78	2.122	1.915	2.455
86	-0.057	-0.142	0.080
60	0.616	0.695	0.489
64	0.467	0.440	0.511
97	0.249	0.142	0.420
27	0.004	0.014	-0.011
105	1.961	1.496	2.705

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
78	1.901	2.282
86	0.136	0.637
60	2.805	1.728
64	1.821	2.797
97	-0.419	0.028
27	2.036	-0.995
105	0.083	0.204
Constant:	-3.233	-4.250
Mahalanobis D Square	51.843	Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	106	35
Discrim. Funct. II:	29	59

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	78.51%	61.57%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	62.76%	39.42%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	75.17%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	67.04%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	72.05%	50.00%

MALES - PERSONNEL DOMICILES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (30): 1 Pers. Domicile
Group II (111): 2 - 3 Pers. Domiciles
Group III (88): 4 or More Pers. Domiciles
Total: 229

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
78	Emotional Stability at PH
86	Highest Acad. Grade at PH: Subprim. thru 2nd Gr.
60	Type of Admission: Voluntary or Probate
64	Initiators of Admiss.: Foster, H & W, Civil, Town
97	Attitude Toward PH Vocat. Tasks: Avge. thru Poor
27	Home Structure on Admission: Solo Types
105	Number of Escapes at PH
101	Affect Toward Peers at PH
76	Mental Level on Admission

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS
78	2.122	1.533	2.018	2.455
86	-0.057	-0.167	-0.135	0.080
60	0.616	0.700	0.694	0.489
64	0.467	0.500	0.423	0.511
97	0.249	0.100	0.153	0.420
27	0.004	0.000	0.018	-0.011
105	1.961	1.200	1.577	2.705
101	1.611	1.433	1.387	1.955
76	28.563	32.033	26.838	29.557

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. III COEFFICIENT
78	1.701	2.119	2.365
86	-0.410	-0.143	0.270
60	2.001	2.333	1.139
64	2.662	2.404	3.446
97	-0.452	-0.497	-0.042
27	0.003	1.591	-1.777
105	-0.041	-0.016	0.084
101	0.360	0.215	0.407
76	0.308	0.258	0.287
Constant:	-7.844	-7.048	-8.828

Mahalanobis D Square 68.490 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III
Discrim. Funct. I:	15	8	7
Discrim. Funct. II:	45	42	24
Discrim. Funct. III:	17	18	53

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	19.48%	13.10%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	61.76%	48.49%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	63.09%	38.40%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	50.00%	33.33%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	37.83%	33.33%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	60.22%	33.33%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	48.03%	33.33%

FEMALES - PERS. DOMICILES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

1 - 3 Personnel Domiciles vs 4 or More Pers. Domiciles

No. of Observations 177
Step No. 3

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
101	-0.219	0.059	3.72	1%	13.66	0.1%
118	-0.212	0.082	2.57	2%	7.53	1.0%
5	-0.130	0.055	2.34	5%	5.48	2.5%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.817 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.893 R SQUARE: 0.138

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	1 TO 3 DOMICILES	4 OR MORE DOMICILES
101	Good Affect re Peers at PH	Poor Affect re Peers at PH
118	Not Self Supporting at Discharge	Self Supporting at Discharge
5	No Property Destruct. before PH	Property Destruct. before PH

FEMALES - PERS. DOMICILES - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

2 - 3 Personnel Domiciles vs 4 or More Pers. Domiciles

No. of Observations 153
Step No. 4

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
101	-0.298	0.063	4.75	1%	13.60	0.1%
118	-0.211	0.094	2.24	5%	5.41	2.5%
102	0.123	0.048	2.55	2%	4.91	5.0%
82	0.109	0.053	2.08	5%	4.32	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.185   ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.909   R SQUARE: 0.167

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	2 AND 3 DOMICILES	4 OR MORE DOMICILES
101	Good Affect re Peers	Poor Affect re Peers
118	Not Self Supporting at Discharge	Self Supporting at Discharge
102	Heterosexual Acting Out	No Heterosexual Acting Out
82	Poor Health at PH	Good Health at PH

B - 41

FEMALES - PERSONNEL DOMICILES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (116): 1 - 3 Personnel Domiciles
Group II (61): 4 or More Pers. Domiciles
Total: 177

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
101	Affect Toward Peers at PH
118	Condition of Discharge: Self-Support
102	Heterosexual Acting Out at PH
5	Property Destruction before PH
82	General Health at PH

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
101	1.492	1.259	1.934
118	0.548	0.466	0.705
102	1.333	1.397	1.213
5	0.492	0.284	0.885
82	3.825	3.948	3.590

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
101	0.693	1.343
118	1.235	1.777
102	0.640	0.437
5	0.078	0.389
82	2.086	1.850
Constant:	-5.299	-5.684

Mahalanobis D Square 35.070 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	82	34
Discrim. Funct. II:	26	35

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	75.92%	65.53%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	50.72%	34.46%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	70.68%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	57.37%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	66.10%	50.00%

FEMALES - PERSONNEL DOMICILES - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (24):	One Personnel Domicile
Group II (92):	2 - 3 Personnel Domiciles
Group III (61):	4 or More Pers. Domiciles
Total:	177

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
101	Affect Toward Peers at PH
118	Condition of Discharge: Self-Support
102	Heterosexual Acting Out at PH
5	Property Destruction before PH
82	General Health at PH

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS	GROUP III MEANS
101	1.492	1.417	1.217	1.934
118	0.548	0.250	0.522	0.705
102	1.333	0.792	1.554	1.213
5	0.492	0.125	0.326	0.885
82	3.825	3.917	3.957	3.590

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. III COEFFICIENT
101	0.869	0.615	1.316
118	1.006	1.319	1.791
102	0.363	0.749	0.464
5	-0.059	0.134	0.401
82	2.002	2.103	1.848
Constant:	-4.802	-5.483	-5.679

Mahalanobis D Square 43.913 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II	EVALUATED AS GROUP III
Discrim. Funct. I:	16	5	3
Discrim. Funct. II:	29	53	10
Discrim. Funct. III:	18	18	25

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	25.39%	13.58%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	69.73%	51.95%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	65.78%	34.46%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	66.66%	33.33%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	57.60%	33.33%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	40.98%	33.33%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	53.10%	33.33%

1 - 3 Pers. Domiciles vs 4 or More Pers. Domiciles

% of All 1's & 2's Correctly Identified:	74.10%	65.53%
% of All 3's Correctly Identified:	65.78%	34.46%
% of Group I & II Correctly Identified:	88.79%	66.55%
% of Group III Correctly Identified:	40.98%	32.78%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	72.31%	55.16%

MALES - MARITAL STATUS - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Married vs Single

No. of Observations 232
Step No. 6

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
17	0.083	0.037	2.26	5%	7.87	1.0%
113	-0.464	0.110	4.21	1%	5.83	2.5%
93	-0.084	0.042	2.00	5%	7.73	1.0%
97	-0.192	0.069	2.78	1%	6.17	2.5%
112	-0.288	0.110	2.62	1%	5.64	2.5%
120	-0.220	0.109	2.01	5%	4.04	5.0%

PURE CONSTANT: -0.212 ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.797 R SQUARE: 0.149

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	MARRIED	SINGLE
17	M-R Identified When Pt. Older	M-R Identified When Pt. Younger
113	Not 1 - 3 Trial Visits	1 - 3 Trial Visits
93	Higher Soc. Level at PH	Lower Soc. Level at PH
97	Not Avge-Poor Att. re Voc. Tasks	Avge-Poor Attit. re Voc. Tasks at PH
112	Not Zero Trial Visits	Zero Trial Visits
120	Not Unimproved at Discharge	Unimproved at Discharge

FEMALES - MARITAL STATUS - MULTILINEAR REGRESSION

Married vs Single

No. of Observations 179
Step No. 4

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	ERROR OF COEFFICIENT	T	SIGNIF. OF T	F	SIGNIF. OF F
84	-0.226	0.110	2.06	5%	10.04	0.5%
102	0.111	0.046	2.41	2%	7.59	1.0%
82	-0.122	0.051	2.42	2%	6.23	2.5%
44	-0.181	0.077	2.35	5%	5.51	2.5%

PURE CONSTANT: 0.495　　ERROR OF ESTIMATE: 0.933　　R SQUARE: 0.151

CORRELATIONS IN BRIEF

VAR	MARRIED	SINGLE
84	No Physical Handicap	Physical Handicap
102	Heterosexual Acting Out	No Heterosexual Acting Out
82	Good Health at PH	Poor Health at PH
44	Father: Not UM to Lower Class	Father: UM to Lower Class

FEMALES - MARITAL STATUS - DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Group I (85): Married
Group II (94): Single
Total: 179

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

NO.	SUBJECT
84	General Physical Handicap
102	Heterosexual Acting Out at PH
82	General Health at PH
44	Father's Social Class: Upper-Middle thru Lower

VARIABLE	COMMON MEANS	GROUP I MEANS	GROUP II MEANS
84	1.302	1.141	1.447
102	1.341	1.704	1.011
82	3.827	3.494	4.128
44	-0.374	-0.600	-0.170

VARIABLE	DISCRIM. FUNCT. I COEFFICIENT	DISCRIM. FUNCT. II COEFFICIENT
84	2.627	3.155
102	0.855	0.596
82	1.752	2.038
44	-0.964	-0.542
Constant:	-5.579	-6.834

Mahalanobis D Square 31.446 Signif. at .001

EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

	EVALUATED AS GROUP I	EVALUATED AS GROUP II
Discrim. Funct. I:	63	22
Discrim. Funct. II:	35	59

IDENTIFICATION %

		Random Identification
% of All 1's Correctly Identified:	64.28%	47.48%
% of All 2's Correctly Identified:	72.83%	52.51%
% of Group I Correctly Identified:	74.11%	50.00%
% of Group II Correctly Identified:	62.76%	50.00%
% of Total Correctly Identified:	68.15%	50.00%

CODING FOR SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

PRE-ADMISSION VARIABLES

VAR. 1 **BIRTHDATE YEAR** **QUANT**

Entries	Code
e.g. 1890	890
1891	891
1900	900
1901	901
1932	932
etc.	etc.

VAR. 5 **PROPERTY DESTRUCTION (BEFORE PH)** **QUANT**

Entries	Code
None, or No Info	0
None to Slight	1
Slight	2
Slight to Moderate	3
Moderate	4
Moderate to Considerable	5
Considerable	6
Considerable Plus	7

VAR. 6 **PROPERTY THEFT** **QUANT**

Entries	Code
None, or No Info	0
None to Slight	1
Slight	2
Slight to Moderate	3
Moderate	4
Moderate to Considerable	5
Considerable	6
Considerable Plus	7

AFFECT RE MOTHER **QUAL**

VAR. 7	Positive Affect, Affection
VAR. 8	"Average", "No Comment" Type
VAR. 9	Negative Types
MINUS 1	No Information

VAR. 13 **SOCIAL SCHOOL GRADES** **QUANT**

Entries	Code
First Grade, Pre-primary, or None	1
Second Grade (& Ungraded)	2
Third	3
Fourth	4
etc.	etc.
Tenth	10

VAR. 17 AGE OF PATIENT WHEN M-R IDENTIFIED **QUANT**

Entries	Code
Birth to 3 Years	1
4 - 5 Years	2
6 - 9 Years	3
10 - 12 Years	4
13 - 15 Years	5
16 - 19 Years	6
20 Plus Years	7

VAR. 18 NEGATIVE SOCIAL HISTORY OF PATIENT **QUANT**

Entries	Code
None Recorded	1
Instit. History, Arrests, etc.	3

HOME STRUCTURE AT AGE 1 YEAR **QUAL**

VAR. 21	Both Parents
VAR. 22	Mother Alone, Mother & Rels, Mother & StepFa., Father Alone
VAR. 23	Relatives, Adoptive Parents, Foster, Boarding Home, Orphanage, etc.
MINUS 1	Unknowns

HOME STRUCTURE ON ADMISSION TO PINELAND **QUAL**

VAR. 24	Both Parents
VAR. 25	Mother Alone, & Combinations
	Father Alone, & Combinations, Rels, Adoptive, etc.
VAR. 26	Foster, Boarding, etc., Correctional Instituts., Other Institutions, Hospitals, etc.
VAR. 27	Solo, "On His Own", etc.
MINUS 1	Unknowns

PATIENT LEGITIMATE **QUAL**

VAR. 28	Patient is Legitimate
MINUS 1	Patient is Illegitimate

PATIENT'S POSITION IN SIBSHIP **QUAL**

VAR. 31	Only Child
VAR. 32	First Born (of Group)
VAR. 33	Second Child
VAR. 34	Middle Child (of Group of 5 or More)
VAR. 35	Next to Last
VAR. 36	Last
MINUS 1	"Situation Confused" (Order Has Changed) & Unknowns

FATHER'S ETHNICITY **QUAL**

VAR. 39	Yankee (& Anglo-Canadian)
VAR. 40	French Canadian
MINUS 1	Others (Which Total a Very Small Minority in Maine)

	MOTHER'S DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND	QUAL
VAR. 42	Rural, Maritime, Village	
VAR. 43	Town & Urban	
MINUS 1	Mixed Rural & Urban, Unknowns	

	FATHER'S SOCIAL CLASS	QUAL
VAR. 44	Upper-Middle, Middle, Middle-Lower, Lower	
MINUS 1	Lower-to-Nadir, Nadir, Unknown	

	FATHER'S DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND	QUAL
VAR. 45	Rural, Maritime, Village	
VAR. 46	Town & Urban	
MINUS 1	Mixed Rural & Urban, Unknowns	

	MOTHER'S EDUCATION	QUAL
VAR. 47	0 to 4th Grade	
VAR. 48	4 - 8th Grade through High School Incomplete	
VAR. 49	High School Complete through College Complete	
MINUS 1	Unknowns	

VAR. 54 ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION BY FATHER QUANT

Entries	Code
Good treatment	1
"Average" - Unremarkable	3
Fair Treatment	4
Poor Treatment	6

	TYPES OF ADMISSION TO HOSPITAL	QUAL
VAR. 60	Probate Court, Voluntary	
VAR. 61	Transfer from Correctional Institutions, Municipal Court, Superior Court	
MINUS 1	O. Types of Transfers	

	INITIATORS OF ADMISSION	QUAL
VAR. 62	Mother and Father	
VAR. 63	Mother Alone, Father Alone, Other Kin	
VAR. 64	Foster Homes, State Agencies (H&W), Civil & Town Authorities	
VAR. 65	Courts, Police, Law	
VAR. 66	Misc. Others in Community, Orphanage, etc. Correctional, M-R School, Mental Hospital	
MINUS 1	Uncertain	

INSTITUTIONAL PERIOD VARIABLES

VAR. 68 AGE DISCHARGED FROM INSTITUTION QUANT

Entries	Code
6 Years	06
etc.	etc.
10 Years	10
etc.	etc.
59 Years	59
etc.	etc.

VAR. 69 YEAR OF DISCHARGE QUANT

Entries	Code
1952	52
etc.	etc.
1960	60
1961	61

VAR. 71 LEGAL STAY AT PHTC IN YEARS QUANT

Entries	Code
1 Year (or Less)	010
2 Years	020
etc.	etc.
10 Years	100
etc.	etc.

VAR. 73 IQ ON DISCHARGE QUANT

Entries	Code
IQ of 1	001
etc.	etc.
IQ of 10	010
etc.	etc.
IQ of 99	099
IQ of 101	101
etc.	etc.

VAR. 76 MENTAL LEVEL ON ENTRY (DIAGNOSIS) QUANT
(Older terminology is used here.)

Entries	Code
Normal	01
Dull Normal	10
Borderline	20
Moron	30
Imbecile	40
Idiot	50

VAR. 78 EMOTIONAL STABILITY - GENERAL QUANT

Entries	Code
Excellent & Good	1
"Average"	2
Fair	3
Poor	5
Very Poor	6

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIAGNOSIS QUAL

VAR. 79 No Comment, "Good Prognosis", etc.
VAR. 80 Personality Disorder, Characterological Disorder
VAR. 81 Formal Mental Disorder
MINUS 1 Specific Organic Disorders

VAR. 82 GENERAL HEALTH QUANT

Entries	Code
Excellent	01
Excell. to Good	02
Good	03
Good to "Average"	04
"Average"	05
"Average" to Fair	06
Fair	08
Fair to Poor	09
Poor	14

PHYSICAL ILLNESSES QUAL

VAR. 83 None
MINUS 1 Any Physical Illness, All Types

VAR. 84 PHYSICAL HANDICAP QUANT

Entries	Code
None	1
Slight	2
Slight-Mod.	3
Moderate	4
Mod.-Pronounced	5
Pronounced	6
Pron.-Extreme	7
Extreme	8

HIGHEST ACADEMIC GRADES ACHIEVED AT PINELAND QUAL

VAR. 86 Subprimary, First, Second Grades
VAR. 87 3rd Grade through 8th Grade
MINUS 1 No Academic Training Received

VAR. 90 OTHER TRAINING TYPES QUANT

Entries	Code
Had Other Training, All Types	05 thru 75
None Recorded	00

VAR. 91 OTHER TRAINING TYPES - ADDITIONAL QUANT

Entries	Code
Had Other Training, All Types	05 thru 75
None Recorded	00

VAR. 92 EUGENIC STERILIZATION QUANT

Entries	Code
Not Sterilized	0
Was Sterilized	1

VAR. 93 LEVEL OF SOCIAL FUNCTIONING AT PINELAND QUANT

Entries	Code
Highest	01
Higher	03
High-Mid	05
Middle	07
Mid-Low	09
Lower	11
Low-Bottom	13
Bottom	15

ATTITUDES RE ACADEMIC TASKS AT PINELAND QUAL

VAR. 94	Excellent, Good, Good to "Average"
VAR. 95	"Average", "Avge"-Fair, Fair & Mixed, Fair-Poor, Poor
MINUS 1	No Academic Training Received

ATTITUDES RE VOCATIONAL TASKS AT PINELAND QUAL

VAR. 96	Excellent, Good, Good to "Average"
VAR. 97	"Average", "Avge"-Fair, Fair & Mixed, Fair-Poor, Poor
MINUS 1	No Vocational Tasks at PH, No Data

VAR. 98 PROPERTY DESTRUCTION AT PINELAND QUANT

Entries	Code
None, or No Info	0
None to Slight	1
Slight	2
Slight to Moderate	3
Moderate	4
Moderate to Considerable	5
Considerable	6
Considerable Plus	7

VAR. 101 AFFECT RE PEERS, ETC. QUANT

Entries	Code
Friendly, Affection, etc.	1
Troublesome (Verbal)	3
Physical Violence	5

VAR. 102 HETEROSEXUAL ACTING OUT **QUANT**

Entries	Code
Absent, No Record	0
Slight	1
Slight-Mod.	2
Moderate	3
Mod.-Considerable	4
Considerable	5
Consid.-Extreme	6
Extreme, Excess	7

VAR. 105 NUMBER OF ESCAPES **QUANT**

Entries	Code
None	00
One	01
Two	02
3	03
4	04
5	05
etc.	etc.
10	10
etc.	etc.
17	17

VAR. 108 HOME VISITS **QUANT**

Entries	Code
None or Very Rare	1
Limited Visits	3
Numerous Visits	5

VAR. 110 BOARD PAYMENTS **QUANT**

Entries	Code
State Entirely	1
State & Home, Mixed	4
Home Entirely	7

PATIENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD POSSIBLE DISCHARGE **QUAL**

VAR. 111	General Wish for Discharge
MINUS 1	None Recorded, Negative Attitudes

NUMBER OF TRIAL VISITS (EMPLOYMENT) **QUAL**

VAR. 112	No Visits Recorded
VAR. 113	1 to 3 Visits
VAR. 114	4 to 10 Visits
MINUS 1	11 and Over

CONDITION OF DISCHARGE **QUAL**

VAR. 118	Capable of Self Support
MINUS 1	All Other Conditions

	IMPROVED AT DISCHARGE	QUAL
VAR. 119	Improved	
VAR. 120	Not Improved	
MINUS 1	No Statement	

VAR. 124 STRUCTURAL CHANGES - AGE 10 THROUGH 14 QUANT

Entries	Code
None	0
One	1
Two	2
Three	3
Four	4
Five	5
Six	6
Seven or More	7

EC030026

ED0 43152

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER

BOX C, POWNAL, MAINE 04069

PETER W. BOWMAN, M.D.
SUPERINTENDENT

BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

TO

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

JOHN L. HOFFMAN, Ph.D.

REPORT ON PROJECT RD-1606-P
TO THE
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

EC 030 026 E

+2

EC0300

ED043152

BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

to

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

RD-1606-P

Peter W. Bowman, M.D.
Project Director

John L. Hoffman, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator & Author

Interview Staff:
Lucille H. Dwinal
Barbara A. Britten
Hildegarde H. Ayer

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER
Box C
Pownal, Maine 04069

September 30, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This investigation was supported, in part, by
Research Grant No. RD-1606-P from the
Division of Research and Demonstration Grants
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C., 20201

PREFACE

This is the Biographical Supplement to the formal Final Report on a research project that is a multifaceted longitudinal study of all patients who were discharged from Pineland Hospital and Training Center from July, 1952 through June, 1961. Pineland is the State of Maine's sole residential facility for the education, training, and treatment of the retarded.

It is our hope that this Biographical Supplement will add a more personal dimension to an otherwise quite statistical study. The supplement begins with an autobiography of one dischargee, and then continues with more than 50 selected interview reports describing the post-discharge circumstances of other dischargees. These interviews were chosen from over 500 such reports. They are presented here in a kind of sequence that runs from extremes of dependence through various levels and types of adjustment -- and maladjustment -- to complete independence and self support.

The aim is not to offer an absolute taxonomy but to give some view of the great diversity of adjustment subsumed by such a group of institutional dischargees, to suggest a number of more frequently observed aggregations of elements of social behavior, and to tell what seems to be the truth about the dischargees' many social conditions.

Some of this truth may be controversial, and some of it should be disturbing. Much progress has been made, and rather incredible philosophies on permanent and brutal custodiality for the retarded have been abandoned. But there still remains much work to be done. Furthermore, in an imperfect world, dischargees from an institution are not magically exempt from the difficulties and ills that beset "normal" people.

Controversy of course could easily have been avoided, and with it the possible criticism by the ignorant of newer policies of institutional discharge. An expurgated selection of sterile and conventionally "successful" cases could easily have been presented instead of the present one. Such short-sighted censorship however would do little to illuminate the victories and failures of our dischargees in the broadest context, to identify their true life styles, their problems, and their needs, and to point the way to improved policies, programs, and services from many disciplines. If a score or so of our dischargees have foundered badly, it must be remembered that less than 20 years ago the only remedy offered was custodial life imprisonment for almost all 569 of these patients. Although absolute prediction at present may not be 100% possible, it is today still more impossible to turn back the calendar to a lurid custodial past.

The echoes of several heritages will be found in our interviews. One heritage is that of this custodial and punitive past, when Pineland was the old Pownal State School with its corrosive and destructive impact on the minds and personalities of the patients, and its permanent residue of self-doubt, and of fear and hostility toward the captor. A more recent era, from 1953 on, brought sweeping humanitarian changes and a brighter heritage. But to declare that perfection was achieved in, say, 1959 would be to disparage all improvements made since that time, and to depreciate all present goals for institutional progress.

This brief introduction does not attempt to be a cognitive guide to our panorama of cases. A kind of running account accompanies these cases, and the interview reports individually incorporate their own explanations. However, the complete social, psychological, and moral significance of the cases, taken individually and collectively, most often goes without lengthy analysis and discussion. Its fuller consideration is left to the perceptions of the reader.

The great majority of these interview reports were written by Miss Lucille Dwinal and Miss Barbara Britten, as an adjunct to their collection of data from and about dischargees for the tabular and statistical sections of the report. A somewhat informal and impressionistic style has been consciously and purposely used throughout, rather than the more orthodox and perhaps more arid "case history" format. The autobiographical account was obtained through several tape-recorded interviews conducted by Miss Hildegarde Ayer. The understanding, insight, and general excellence of all these interviewers cannot be overestimated or overpraised. It has been a most difficult task to make a limited choice among so many reports having such great inherent interest and illustrative value.

No commendations here could conscionably go without mention of the mainstay of our office staff, Mrs. Dorothy H. Jones, whose diverse skills and unflagging efforts have contributed so much to the achievement of our project goals.

***

To protect the identity of the dischargees and others, pseudonyms for persons and places are used almost entirely throughout, and consistently so from case to case. With the personal names used, any resemblance to actual names of persons living or dead is of course purely coincidental and unintentional. The use of certain less than conventional pseudonyms for places merely reflects a native exuberance for nomenclature, Maine being a state where only the Little Androscoggin River separates Norway from South Paris.

As the dischargee's year of birth is given in each case's introductory paragraph, and as most of the interviews were conducted in 1964 and 1965, the age of the dischargee at the time of interview can be approximated accordingly.

On page 116 there is provided a glossary of abbreviations used, some of these being idiosyncratic to this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

AUTOBIOGRAPHY 1
  Henry Taylor 1

THE SEVERELY RETARDED 13
  George Fielding 13
  Donald Morin 15
  Arthur Robichaud 16

ECONOMIC & SOCIAL DEPENDENCE ... 19
 THE ELDERLY 19
  The Wardwell Farm 19
  Carroll Wells 20
  Amy Williams 21
 NON-ELDERLY ADULTS 23
  Emily Caldwell 23
  Leonard Shadwell 24
  Arthur Chapel 25
  Sherman Davis 26
  Hewitt Conley 28
 THE YOUNG 29
  Paul O'Malley 29

SOCIAL DEPENDENCE AND ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE 31
 THE LOWER MARGINS 31
  Mavis Holliston 31
  Andrew Farrar 32
  Jennie Lyman 34
 DOMESTIC WORK 35
  Abigail Hayes 35
  Marjorie Carter 37
  Marion Mcguire 39
 FARM WORK 40
  Al Lovelace 40
  Gregory Adams 41
 HOME BASED 42
  Johnny Carney 42
  Roland Cyr 43
 THE UPPER MARGINS 46
  James Howe 46
  Foster Conley 47

MARRIAGE 49
 CHANGE OF STATUS 49
  Beatrice Dow 49
  Marion Johnson 51

Page

 SOME VARIABLES 53
  Linda Maloy 53
  Janie Maguire 55
  Eileen Hardy 57
 HOUSEKEEPERS 58
  Julie Marston 59
  Caroline Rogers 60
  Irma Folsom 62
 SOCIALLY MARGINAL 64
  Minnie Lester 64
  Winslow Forrest 65

ABERRENT EXTREMES 68
 SELECTED FEMALES 68
  Alice Allen 69
  Melissa Williams 71
  Maxene Lindsey 72
  Elaine Dexter 74
 MALES - CORRECTIONAL 78
  James Moore 78
  Bertrand Lessard 82
 MALES - DISTURBED 84
  Ernest Park 84
  Bill Dellenbaugh 89
 MALES - FLOUNDERING 92
  Cedric Beach 92
  Leon Latham 93
 AN INSTITUTIONALIZED PRODUCT .. 95
  Howard Winfield 95

ECONOMIC & SOCIAL INDEPENDENCE .. 97
 ENDOGAMOUS MARRIAGES 97
  Richard Walker & Theresa Redding 97
  Dennis Hall & Anita Nadeau 100
  Phillip Peterson & Mary Blanchard 103
 EXOGAMOUS MARRIAGES 104
  Ethel Warren 104
  Gabrielle Desjardins 106
 THE UNMARRIED 107
  Wilfred Bennett 108
  Beatrice Knight 109
  Donald Simard 110
  Miles Kent 112

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS 116

HENRY TAYLOR

The following autobiographical account tells something of the life of a patient who was admitted to the old Pownal State School (now Pineland Hospital) in 1925 at the age of 11, and finally discharged in 1953 at the age of 39. Despite institutional admission, this patient apparently had always been of normal intelligence and disposition. His mother had died when he was an infant. His father supported him in a foster home until the father's death when the boy was about 8 years old. He then came under the custody of the state board of children's guardians, which on some pretext managed to unload him at Pownal three years later. Requests and pleas of the former foster home for his return to them were met with acid refusals by the authoritarian and dogmatic superintendent of that past era. With the advent of new policies and directions for the institution, Henry Taylor finally achieved his discharge in 1953.

This autobiographical narrative was obtained by Miss Ayer in 1966, and is presented here with only minimal editing and rearrangement of the original Q & A tape-recorded format. No attempt has been made to alter the grammar and phraseology. The account gives a first-hand picture of the whole process of institutional admission, of becoming and being institutionalized, and then of subsequent efforts to adapt to life in the community. As the dischargee here speaks for himself in his own words, so this account in a larger sense speaks by itself of the impact of long institutionalization on a human life. The reader is left free to speculate on what this life might have been with better education and continued community experience during the formative years. The account follows:

My mother died when I was a year and a half old. No, I don't remember her.

I was boarding with a private family...my father had placed me with these people and he was working on the Grand Trunk Railroad at the time. He died while I was staying with these people, and so the people that I was staying with were the ones who put me on the state.

After they put me on the state they still wanted to keep me - they didn't want me to go away. So they kept me for three years after that, and then after that they put me at Pineland. I was eleven years old.

I never did know why. They never did say anything. They just notified the people that I was staying with and I was in school at the time, and when I got back from school she just told me that the next day somebody was coming after me, and that they were going to take me some place. She didn't know where herself. But she told me after I was discharged that had she known I was going down there that she would have adopted me.

It was a state woman that took me and she told me that she was taking me to a school where there would be a lot of children and that I'd like it. I kind of thought that I was going into a home with children and it would be something like my own home, and you could go in and out when you wanted to and you'd do practically like you would in your own home. That's what my idea was, but after I got there I found out different.

On the way going down, of course, I was homesick because I like these people. They were just like my own people, and I was quite homesick, of course. But when I got down there, after I arrived there and they, the doctor, told me what building I was going to, well, I did meet a couple fellows that I knew there, that I knew before I went there. I was pretty happy with them but we did run away that night. We ran away that night, just these two fellows and I, we ran away. Well, this was in December. It was the tenth day of December. It was very cold that night.

But you know, when you get into a new place and you're homesick, you can get all kinds of ideas. But we had it planned up that we were going. We had a window downstairs that we had taken the cleats off. They used to have cleats on the windows so that you couldn't get the top down. But we had taken them out sometime during the day so that at night we'd have a place to get out.

Well, we got out, and we were half way home before they caught us. And then, of course, when they took us back they took and they clipped all our hair all off. They put us to bed. We were in bed - I don't remember exactly how long now, but we were in bed several weeks. We wasn't tied, but we didn't have any privileges. We had to stay in bed. And after that, after two or three weeks, they let us up and we were with the others but we were watched more or less.

Well, I don't know, I felt - I didn't know what to do. Of course, I was very lonesome and it stayed with me quite awhile, I know. I don't exactly remember all that happened after that.

I was in Pownal Hall. They had the young children downstairs and the men upstairs. We always had to stay in the day room, and the day room was always locked. They used to keep the day room locked most of the time. They wouldn't let us out anywhere, and of course we never had anything to play with in the day room. We only went out when the other kids did - and if the other kids go out then we went out. And, of course, the doors being all locked, that was another thing, living under rules and regulations.

When I went there Dr. Hawkes was superintendent down there. He was kind of a harsh man, I guess. We didn't see too much of him, really. Of course he had orders to give to somebody and they carried them out. But I never had any dealings with him myself, so as far as I was concerned he was very nice to me. But to some of the others he was pretty harsh.

Of course, the boys and girls were not allowed to correspond or talk with each other then, and if you were or if they caught you waving to one of the girls or writing notes to them or something, well, then you was punished.

The attendants, sometimes they were kind of harsh, too. I know we had one there who was quite harsh with us. He used to hit us with a hose, you know. He had a piece of rubber hose. If we were too noisy or something, he'd go around and he'd hit everybody. And he did that quite often. We had another fellow there that was quite harsh. He'd carry brass knuckles in his pocket. And we didn't discover it until one day, I guess they dropped out. That's how we happened to know it.

To punish you they'd make you lose your movies or they'd put you to bed. They'd put you in a room for a few days, and things like that. I know there was at certain times cold baths given - cold packs, but I don't remember how or exactly what that was for.

We used to have a man there that used to use a paddle on us, you know. They had a great big paddle - soap paddle - we used to call it a soap paddle, a thing that they stirred soap with, and they'd lick you with that sometimes if you did things that you weren't supposed to. And if you had a duty that you were supposed to do, if you were supposed to go to bed or if you were told to do something and you wasn't doing it, well then, they'd take and they'd lick you with this paddle. Some of them sometimes were marked pretty much. But there wasn't too much done about it. Of course the attendants used to get away with more things then than they do now. They'd pick stuff that they'd get

3

away with, more or less. For myself, as I said, I got used pretty well, but of course, some of the others did get slapped.

After awhile I was quite a bit at home. As far as that goes, I found a lot of friends, and I got along pretty well. I went to school for eight or nine years. I was in what they called 7A then. There were six or seven grades in the school, and we had more than 30 or 40 pupils and there was about a quarter of that who could make the grade, so they figured there wasn't any sense of keeping so many other grades, so they stopped. We only went to school a half a day. They just felt you were there to be taken care of and you just lived from day to day. As far as trying to show you anything, there wasn't too much done about that. I thought that some of the teachers - some of the attendants had - what would you call it - they had favorites, you know. And you might....we'll say that I was sitting along side John, and the teacher might have more favoritism towards John than he did towards me, and there was a lot of that, and that's the way it went, and that's why a lot of them didn't learn too much. Of course, nobody figured we'd learn anything anyway. We wasn't responsible. I think that it was really to occupy our time - to take up our time - it was just another place to send you to get rid of you from one of the wards.

They had the manual training department and then they had what they called the occupational therapy, kind of an industrial thing. They taught the kids how to make rugs and wash clothes, and they had these little looms that they weaved neckties on. But they weren't beautiful....if you could have seen the neckties! They weren't so good, but they were neckties. That's about all they did, I guess. That was the only two places - the manual training and the industrial department that I mentioned that they had. As I said, they had a lot of favorites, and the ones that was favorites, well, then they got everything and the others, well, they didn't get nothing. You just had to take what you could get. They never helped us out any, really, in those early years. I don't remember too much after that.

When Dr. Merrill became superintendent things remained pretty much the same as they were when Dr. Hawkes was there. But he was pretty reasonable, more than Dr. Hawkes. He listened to the patients more than Dr. Hawkes did, and, of course, I guess the others had difficulty with him but I never had difficulty with him. He was always good to me.

Not too, too many got discharged when Dr. Merrill was superintendent. I don't remember now who they were that did get discharged but not too many. Of course, we were always told not to bother our families about getting out, that we had three meals a day, a place to sleep, and we went outdoors, and had movies, and not to bother relatives. That's what they kept telling us all the time....to be satisfied with what we had because they'd say, "What would you do if you got out? You haven't a trade." After awhile I got so I didn't care, so I felt pretty contented, and, of course, I got along all right. I never had too much trouble.

We didn't have anyone to help us because you couldn't talk with anyone. Because if you wanted to talk to them they never took your word. The attendant's word was it, as far as that goes. The patient was irresponsible. And the attendants, if they said anything, if they said you was this, that's what you were, that's what you did, and there was no way out. Of course, if you can go to somebody and tell how you are being used, and you know yourself that you are telling the facts and that the attendants had used you mean, and you aren't exaggerating, well, the attendants always was it, and we didn't get....

I wasn't sure whether I'd ever get out or not. Of course, no one cared for me and I didn't have anybody to write to except a lady that I had stayed with before I went there. She was just like my mother. I corresponded with her quite often. But after I got used to the surroundings and started to do like the others, I got along pretty well. I made friends around there - with the employees the same way.

We did all the work - we always did all the work. The attendants didn't do anything. The attendants would just do the supervising. They used to make us work pretty much. Like scrubbing the floors, washing walls, and washing windows, making beds, and all that stuff. I was doing some of the work that the attendants did do. Well, I looked after the patients, like washing them up, dressing them up, and taking them out. They used to let me take them out, etc. And I got along all right with them.

The attendants told me that they thought that I didn't belong there because I was doing the work that they were doing and they didn't see any sense of their being paid to work if I was able to do the work.

To tell the truth, I never felt anything towards the attendants at all. I just felt that I was doing something and I felt kind of free, you know, because I had a few extra privileges, you know, like while I was there I was allowed to go out of doors alone where the others didn't. But I had a parole card with me which they gave me, for the ones that were able to go out alone. We had parole cards and so I felt free that way.

They wanted us to be contented. We had three meals a day and we had a bed to sleep in, etc. Well, I got so I felt that way. Well, I felt - I was kind of afraid, you know. I says, now what if I get out, I don't know how to act with people outside and being in an institution you're so used to rules and regulations, of course, and you get used to that routine and that's all you know, where on the outside it would be different. You could do just as you wanted to - to a limit.

Miss Wilson talked to me about it. I told her, I says, "Gosh, I don't know what I'd do." She says, "I think you'd do all right." She says, "You work good around here." She says, "you're a pretty good boy, I think you'd do all right."

Well, I says, "I know, but I haven't any place else to go and my being here so long takes time to get used to the outside life after you've been inside."

You see, I was there 28 years. And I was eleven years old when I went there, and I was 39 when I got out, so that was quite awhile. That's why I always resented about getting out. You know, I wasn't sure about getting out, when I did get out. But after I got started I got along pretty well.

When they put me out on parole, I felt very lost myself. But I haven't got any relatives. I'm the only one living. I might just as well say I have some relatives but they don't care anything about me, so I say I don't have any. And I felt kind of lost, and I didn't know what I was going to do. I had this going in my mind all the time, but when I got going, I got more confidence. I was okay.

I was still worried because when I got the final word that I was discharged, then I had this loss, kind of lost feeling, see. And I suppose, well, from being there and being told what to do every day and not having my own way by having to have somebody else's way, well, it kind of took that away from me, and that's why I had that kind of lost feeling. I worked there quite awhile after I got discharged.

Before I got discharged and I was on parole, I worked there, and after I got discharged I worked there a little while longer. So, when they told me that I was discharged, well, before then, before I was discharged, they kept telling me when I had my days off to go to Portland or Lewiston or something like that so that I could get used to it. And I couldn't seem to get myself away, you know, to think that I'm free to do as I want to do. I don't know which way to turn, and I was kind of bashful to everybody. I guess there was nothing to be bashful about, but it was just the idea of my being a patient of Pineland and coming out and people seeing me for the first time; of course, I'd be a stranger to everybody - and then people asked you questions where you come from. And if you tell them that you come from Pineland, well, then they began to ridicule you by saying that you're foolish or something must be wrong with you mentally, that you were down there. And you couldn't make them believe anything else.

Well, I think it was about a month or two afterwards that I began to feel better about it, and I got so I felt good about it when I had my day off and I was ready to go. I couldn't wait for my day off. But sometimes down there, of course, if an employee had something special that he wanted to go to, they usually asked me, and, of course, Miss Wilson, she was the one that was responsible for me and if I had any problems or anything, I'd go to her, and, of course, the attendants were not allowed to ask me to work for them at that time while I was on parole, because I was only getting $10 a week.

So when they would ask me like that and she didn't know about it, sometimes it made her peeved because she says, "Now you know, he's only supposed to make so much, and if he goes over that, it puts him into the income bracket." So then the attendants really wasn't so free. Of course, they felt more free to ask me to work for them than one of the other fellows, see, because they couldn't always depend on the other fellows to work for them because naturally they would be quicker to object than I would because I didn't have anything special to go to.

I didn't have anything special to go to, anyway, because I didn't have any car, and these other employees did have cars. So, anyway, I used to work for them once in awhile. They did have employees there that kicked sometimes because - this other employee was a friend of this employee - this employee would kick because I used to work on the same ward and the other fellow worked on another ward, and the other fellow worked with me; he wasn't too ambitious, and it seemed that every time I came on duty I had part of his work to do.

So if I said anything to him, and was irritated about it, and the other fellow heard it, well, he was always sore at me about it, because he'd say, "Now, you don't have to say anything to him, you ain't got nothing to do with him." Well, I'd say, "I'm not supposed to do his work - when I'm on duty I'm supposed to get my work done, in time enough so that when I go off I don't leave any of my work for him to do, so why should he leave any of his work for me?" Well, he said, "Sometimes we're pretty busy, you know."

I said to him, "Well, yes, sometimes that's excusable, but sometimes, too, it looks like it might be planned."

I didn't make any plans, any special plans for when I left Pineland. I got out. I finally got going. I came out here and I got my name in different places to get a job. Of course I went back to where I stayed before I went to Pineland - with a woman I stayed with - she was living with her son and daughter-in-law. She says, "What are you going to do?" I said, "I'm going to find a job out around here somewhere. I'm pretty sure I can get one." And I had my name in different places, as I say, and there's a nephew, well, he wasn't a nephew of hers, it was her husband's niece's husband, and he talked to me about getting me into Hart Textiles, and just about that time that he got ready to get me in there, they had a strike. So that broke that up, but I had my name down to the employment office. They called one day and they asked me about going to Essex Academy to work. Well, I said yes, I would take it, that I'd try it. They told me to be ready and come down to the employment office and the man would pick me up there, the man that was in charge. So I got ready and so, of course, this friend of mine, this lady's son brought me down and I went to the employment office which was on Long Street then, and I went up there and I didn't stay up there at all over night. I got up there around afternoon, and it got around supper time and I didn't like the place where I was staying. So I saw the man that had come and got me and I told him that I didn't want to stay, that I'd like to go back home tonight.

And I went back to my room and changed back to my good clothes and I waited for him to pick me up and bring me back. She told me, the lady that I stayed with, she says, "If you don't like it, you can always come back." And so after that I went to the employment office the next day - the employment office had sent me there - so I went to the employment office the next day and I saw the same woman that had spoke to me about going up there. She says, "What was the trouble with your job up there." I says, "There was nothing the trouble with the job, it was just the living quarters." If you could have seen the room! There was no privacy to it. There was a crack in the door. Anybody could see you without opening the door, and the light fixture fell down - I happened to bump my head on the light fixture and the light fixture fell down, and the man that came over there, he was explaining to me about this room. He says, "Oh, I didn't realize this room was like this." I says, "Well, you don't come over here very often, do you?" "No," he says, "I only come over here once in awhile." And the mattress had been wet on, and there was rope strung all over the place where the man that had slept there before had hung his clothes when he washed them, and I went into the bathroom and there was a ring around the tub where they hadn't washed it out. He says, "That hasn't been washed out. That's where they washed their clothes." There was all kinds of newspaper out in the hall that was torn up all over the floor. Oh, it looked like a regular junk heap, you know.

Well, of course he wanted me to fix it up - he told me to fix it up to suit myself. He says, "I'll get you some paint, I'll get you a new mattress, and I'll get some bed linen to put on your bed." I says, "If you think I'm going to work all day and then go back to my room at night and work all night painting and cleaning up - I ain't gonna do it." I couldn't work 24 hours a day. Besides being up there and being surrounded by woods - there is no amusement up there - anybody wants to go to church up there, where do they go? And he says, "Oh, well, you won't have time to go to church because you'll have too much to do." So, I says, "What does anybody do for amusement around here?" He says, "Oh, well, if you want to go for any amusements, you'll have to walk for a couple of miles - two or three miles." So I said I guess I don't want this, so I come back. As I said, I went to her and I told her, and she said, "Didn't he tell you that he'd get you some paint?" I said, "Yes, but I didn't want to work 24 hours a day. I didn't think that I'd want to work washing dishes all day long and then go back to my room and clean my room and everything." So, as I said, I came back.

She said that there wasn't anything else that she could offer me then. But anyway, after she told me there wasn't anything else for me, I went around to look for work everyday. I didn't find anything, but one day I came downtown and I was getting ready to go along to the employment office and the lady that I was staying with, she had taken a bus - she had got a call while I was gone - and she had taken a bus downtown to see if she could catch me anywhere, which she did. She gave me this piece of paper with this address on it and she says the employment office had called up and they want you to go there. Well, I looked at the address and I had to go to a restaurant on Main St., which I went and they hired me that night. You see, I went to work in the restaurant. I used to work from 4 PM until 12 midnight. So then I had to walk about four miles before I got home because I didn't want to take a taxi with the money that I was making because I wasn't making much. I was only making $18 a week.

Of course, my chum - this lady's son - he was kind of glad that I had got a job, but he was anxious to find out how much I was going to make. And when I showed him my check, he said, "You'll never live on that." I said, "I know that, but it will have to do until I find something else."

I continued working there - I worked there for two weeks, I guess, when I finally had this call from St. Elizabeth's Hospital - it was on a Saturday - and the Sister asked me to come up and see her on a Sunday. And I went up there and she said she wanted me to go to work then, but I said I'll come in Monday. And so I went back home and I told them that I was going to be hired at the hospital on Monday. And on Monday night I went down to the restaurant and I told the manager. I says, "I'm through here, I got another job." And he was mad at me, but he gave me my check and instead of sending me through the same door that I came in to, I went out through the back door. But we're pretty good friends - I see him now and then. He doesn't run the restaurant anymore - the restaurant is still running but he doesn't have charge of it anymore. But I see him now and then.

Nobody asked me questions of where I worked or what I did - but to the Sisters I really did tell them where I was from - and then they'd wonder why I was there - and how I happened to be there, and of course I had to tell them about my early childhood, about how I lost my mother when I was about a year and a half old, and my father died when I was eight years old, and the people I was staying with put me on the state, and when they put me on the state, they still wanted to keep me just the same, which they did for two or three years, and the rest of the story, too. They didn't ridicule me, they don't mention anything about it. They did ask me how many more there were down there like me. Well, I said there was several but they went out. They were discharged.

I'm not mechanically inclined but being in the hospital at Pineland, I had quite a bit of knowledge about that. I'm not doing the same work that I was doing down there but the work that I am doing is work that I had done as a patient. But I enjoy it quite a bit, I feel that I'm working with people and getting paid, although now I'm getting paid every two weeks instead of every week. When we started that kind of hurt my pride a little bit, but I got over that. I didn't know exactly how I was going to make out.

It was just the idea that everything depended on me, that was the idea. When I was down there I was sure that I was going to have something to eat. I was sure I was going to have a roof over my head, I was sure that I was going to have clothes to wear, and no matter whether I worked I still had them things, where now if I stop working completely, and I just sat around here and didn't do anything, I guess I'd just be existing; I wouldn't live very long, I guess.

I'm in the housekeeping department - I was in the maintenance when I first arrived, then they changed it - they split the department so they have two departments now. So my work is like - we do general housekeeping - floor washing, wall washing, window washing, cleaning lights. I have to take care of the rubbish. That's about all. I've been there 11 years. We get regular raises. When I started working there I got about 70 cents an hour - now I get $1.45 an hour, so it's pretty good. We used to get paid every week but within the last couple of years they started paying us every two weeks. It's easier for them with the bookkeeping.

We do come in contact with the nurses and doctors some - not too much.

Our contact is mostly with the Sisters.

I haven't heard of anybody having to be discharged for lack of duty - everybody has always been real good there. It seems that everything runs pretty smoothly. Of course, I've heard different things about Municipal Hospital and it's not run the way our hospital is. There's always a lot of bickering over there. I think our hospital to work in is much easier.

The Sisters get around more to see how the patients are taken care of. They are always sure that they get the best of care, and of course they see to the religious part of the thing, too. They have communion about twice a week or maybe three times. And the priest goes around and visits them quite often - most every day in the afternoon - 'course I'm not around at that time - I don't know what time he comes, but he does go around and make his round. But I know that all the patients have communion every Tuesday and Friday anyway.

I guess it helps their morale more, and I guess they feel happier, and I guess they feel that there is understanding, that's about the reason why they like it.

Of course you get consolation, you know, if you have any particular problems and you are feeling disturbed, if you go and talk to a Sister or talk to one of the Priests, they usually have a way of explaining things out to you, which gives you a different outlook.

I do think that Catholicism teaches us that we do have to take the bitter and the sweetness, because in doing that it helps us gain more merit whereas if we always had happiness it wouldn't be quite the same. You have to learn to accept whatever you have and take it as it would be a sacrifice. I think it changes your manner of thought and your feelings toward God, and I think afterwards you feel more peaceful. Suffering is just another test of people, I would think, to see how they love God, and if they love Him they will stand these things - we won't say that everyone does, but it all depends on their will of thinking and the way they accept it.

I figure that after I die, if I had done anything serious, then I am bound to get a certain amount of punishment for Purgatory, and if I had lived - it all depends on how I had lived - if my good qualities were more than the bad ones, well, I'd know where I'd go. I'd be quite peaceful if I was satisfied with myself - if everything had gone right and thought I had done everything, but had I done anything serious, well I'd be more afraid to die in that state.

Suffering and overcoming it during my earthly life might help in determining to some certain extent, but I don't think that it would make up for all of it. Because God being just as He is, I don't see how He could take me - I'd have to repent, naturally, before I'd be accepted.

I think He really does have life planned for you, but of course, things do happen, so He figures whatever happens you'll accept it.

I'd say He made us all the same, we were all created alike and somehow or other we couldn't all be well educated, and we all are here for a certain purpose in life, and those who are not quite as well educated earn their way just the best way they can with the knowledge that they have, and those that are smarter and have more education, well, it's about the same. It's how you conduct your life.

It hurts God, naturally, when somebody rebels against His will, and I don't think that God holds anything against him, especially because, after all, God thinks that maybe he just doesn't realize what he is doing and how much harm he's doing, and so He forgives everybody and let everybody have what belongs to them, and try to help them out whenever you can and the best way you can.

I go to church every Sunday - I belong to St. John's up here on Wood St.

I have a lot of people I have made friends with since I've been out. I spend most of my time - go out and visit them evenings - different ones now and then - I go downstreet window shopping and those places. And sometimes if I need anything I go in and buy it. As far as sports - bowling or anything like that, I haven't been doing anything like that.

I guess I was afraid to do anything, afraid that I wouldn't make out, it kind of frightened me. I can't stand anybody pushing me into doing something - I've never been able to do that - I have to do it all by myself - and I have to work myself into it gradually. I find that I feel better that way than I would if somebody said, "Go ahead, go ahead, you don't know, go ahead," and they stand there and just watch me - and I can't have anybody watching me. It just makes me nervous somehow or other. If they tell me why don't you try this thing or that thing or why don't you go somewhere and see this thing or that thing, I just have to work myself into it gradually. And another thing that I've developed since I've been out - I hate to get into a crowd, especially when I go to church. I always have to sit on the outside and then I have to get up to let the people in because I don't like to sit in the middle, I feel like I'm being crushed like, that's just started in the last few years. I don't know exactly why I feel this way - it's just something that come onto me all of a sudden. I do sometimes, in a pinch, but I'm very uneasy - I'm shifting from one position to the other - and everybody's looking at me wondering if I'm alright.

I had to learn to get along with the people outside and find out how they lived. And about paying my rent - I had to learn that, and had to buy my clothes. That's about the only thing. The very first thing that I think about when I get paid is to have money for my rent. I guess you'd say that I was living on a budget so to speak, because I have my money all figured out so that I have enough to pay for everything that I owe and still have enough money to go on.

The only thing that I felt was just an embarrassment feeling, you know, I felt bashful. Because I've always been pretty much by myself. I'm not very sociable, really, too much. I don't know, I can't stand being crowded with people, you know. I feel if I'm going out with a crowd of people, I'd have to do almost like they do and sometimes you don't do exactly the same as they do, and I feel that they would make fun of me - the way I'd do things. I feel that I'm probably not as bashful as I was, and I'm not afraid to talk to different people as I was before. Of course, you first being in a community and people seeing you, they look at you as a stranger, and they are all wondering who you are and where you come from and what you're doing there.

There are a lot of problems a person has when he gets out, especially if he's been in there a long time. One thing is he has to find his living conditions, if he has to live in a room and where he....sometimes he might go out to eat and sometimes he might not eat at all, you know. He might have to get adjusted on how to use his money. If he went out to a restaurant to eat, if he didn't know too much about arithmetic or something, he couldn't count his money, and that gives him some kind of a - I don't know what kind of feeling you'd say - but he'd be kind of bashful because he couldn't figure it out and they'd have to figure it out for him, and he'd be kind of bashful in that way.

And another thing is about going to the movies or traveling and certain places bother him quite a bit. They always try to find somebody to go with them - they wouldn't travel alone.

I don't try to avoid any of the boys and girls (other dischargees) if they talk to me, but as I said, I don't go and see any of them as often as I used to for the simple reason that it's just a matter of jealousy, you know. They think, well, you go visit this certain one - I don't know why he can't come over and see me - he's always going over and see so and so - he never comes over and see us. We may get talking about things we did down in Pineland or something. I say, "All you people do is talk about Pineland. You don't know what goes on around you here, in the world. I never hear any of you people say anything about what goes on around the city here or anything that you've done outside, it's always something that you've done back there." "Oh, what do we know, what do we know about these things, we don't care anything about these things." It might be the war or something like that or something that's going on around the city. They never bother to talk about anything like that. The only thing is what they've done among themselves, associating with themselves, being down there, and that's about the only thing that they can talk about.

I don't ignore them, really, and I don't want to make them feel that I think that I'm better than they are, and maybe some of them think so. If I try to tell them that I wasn't, well, it probably wouldn't make any difference, but I don't really ignore them, and I don't think I'm any better than they are. As far as that goes I get along pretty good.

Maybe it would be better not to have all your friends from Pineland, because we would learn more about the outside life and how to get along with people and maybe do a lot of different things. But there are so many of us that still have those ideas with us that we've had down there, that we can't seem to get away from them, I mean, it leaves you but it takes time to get away from them.

If you are ever accused of anything, we'll say that you were in with a crowd and somebody did something that they weren't supposed to, like breaking in or something, and maybe you'd be the first one to be accused. I might be the first one they'd accuse, and I might not be quite so quick to get out of it as they might be, because somebody probably got word from somebody else. As you know, with all the other patients - the other boys and girls, they see us on the street and they holler at you. Well, then they talk to - then the other person that they're talking with, if it happens to be a stranger that I don't know, he'll ask - do you know this fella? Oh, yes, he used to be down in Pineland with me - he comes from Pineland. Well, then, of course, I've lied because maybe I've talked to this person before and he says, well, I've talked to this person and he didn't tell me he came from there, he told me he came from Portland, or he came from Bangor, or he came from Augusta, or some place like that. It's kind of a funny situation sometimes. Especially if you're going to get a job or anything. If you hire out to get a job, naturally you have to tell them if they ask you where you came from, but if you can do it without telling them, of course, it isn't every place that asks you, but you'd be better off, because then they'd figure that you don't really have any trade. So they aren't so apt to hire you - unless it has something to do with housekeeping or working on a farm or something. Of course, you can never realize how the community feels toward you if you've been there. They feel you are just an outcast - that you're just another fool - or an imbecile - or an idiot or whatever, and they don't really try to help you out any. They've never made remarks about others that I know.

I don't know exactly what I'd do if I had my life to live over. Well, I'd probably have the same father, but I wanted to be a priest, because I wanted to get into the religious life, because I didn't think that I'd ever want to get married, of which I haven't yet. I haven't found anybody that I wanted to get married to, and I haven't found anybody that would have me in the first place, because I have a disposition of my own and I know what my disposition is, and I know that when I get irritated I usually say a lot of things that I wouldn't say ordinarily, because after it's all over, it's over and done with. But it's just something that I can't control, really. I think I can't, you see, I could if I tried but I just don't happen to be that way, but I would like to get into the religious life, really, if I had it to do over again. Well, I'd gone through grammar school and gone through high school and probably gone to college, a seminary college, and I would have probably studied for the priesthood.

I might have had to go to work in order to keep on going to school. I know it would cost me something so I'd have to go to work in order to get enough money to go, and I might have to work summers in order to keep on going. That's what I might have done if I'd had the chance to do it.

I thought about it while I was at Pineland, but I said I guess there will never be any chance, because I haven't enough education, because, you see, you only went to a certain grade before you were put out of school, because there weren't enough boys and girls to make the grade.

I have tried to help some of the boys and girls from there in the city here. The reason why I've helped them is because I feel that they come from the same place that I do, and from what I've learned since I've been out, which isn't too, too much, but I hope a little.... but I have found out that some of them I cannot do too much with. Like Bill Dellenbaugh, for instance, when I took him in, he had been thrown out of his own apartment, and I said, well, you can stay here until you find another place. Well, he was very good at the beginning, oh, a few weeks, he paid his part of things, and then all of a sudden he stopped, for the simple reason that I guess he wasn't making too much money, he wasn't working too steady, and the reason why he doesn't work steady is his condition of being maybe lazy, or maybe he is sick in some way, which I haven't been able to find out really.

Gerald Agostino, I've tried to help him, he has so many bills in the city that it wasn't funny, and I tried to impress on him that he should pay on all of his bills, well, he'd do it once and that would be all, and after that he'd just spend it for amusement. And at the different places that he's worked, he never works for any length of time because he wanted more leisure time to himself. He had a job in the shoe shop, he might work there for a couple of weeks then he'd ask the boss for a day off, and give an excuse that he wanted to go someplace or he might call up and say he was sick when he wasn't sick.

Like he did at Riverhead when he worked there, he had me call up the boss and tell them that he was sick. Well, he wasn't sick, really. He did have sore feet - he had blisters on his feet. That was alright - I called the boss and told him he wouldn't be in, but the boss told me to tell him to be in at the end of the week. But that very night he wanted to go roller skating, and his feet weren't sore then but they were too sore to go to work.

Now like it often happens to me when I've helped people, and I've always found out afterwards that they were just trying to make a fool of me, trying to make me look like a fool in front of everybody else. Because I'm not the most educated that there ever was, and so they think that they can get all kinds of things out of me; they think, well, he's easy going, kind-hearted, and we'll go and see him.

Say a fellow comes to you and he wants you to help him do something, or some problem he has and you try to give him some help, and he just sits there and goes along for the ride and lets you do it all. Maybe sometimes it's because he wants to see how you are going to react, your feelings, emotions and things - sometimes you feel as if you aren't helping him, all the time he's just laughing at you, he is making a fool of you. You can detect that and sometimes you can't. If I had just worked with them to help them and have them help themselves, try to impress on them that they have to help themselves, it would have been much better. But this is one of the troubles. You can help a person, it depends on his character, on how he's been brought up, and if he is willing to work along with you and help himself - it's much better than if you did all the work. But it doesn't stop me from helping anybody. I'd help anybody that needed help.

I think that we all need help. Maybe if I helped you if you needed help, I'd think, well, someday, I might need help, and if she's still around, I can go and ask her to help me. But it don't always work out that way.

Some of the boys and girls should never have been at Pineland. They needed other types of care. If a family has a child, his mind is deteriorating, I mean, he's an idiot, really, and he can't do anything for himself, and you have to do everything for him, well, then I think that definitely they should place him there. Maybe they could wait until he got to be a certain age and they couldn't handle him anymore, but of course it isn't everyone that wants to do that. A lot of people like to take care of their own. But if they don't know how to do it, to get him along, well, put him away like that and forget about him. I shouldn't think that his people should forget about him completely. As I said, a lot of people would put their children away and forget about them. The child is not able to read and write and when they go to see him they can't carry on a conversation with him because he has nothing very interesting to talk about. They figure, well, as long as he's getting his three meals a day, and a bed to sleep on, and a roof over his head, that's all that's necessary. And they just leave him there. If they visited him he'd get a feeling that somebody did care for him, which would make him feel different. Where if they just went there and dumped him off and never went near him, he'd get so he'd forget about his people and he wouldn't care whether they came or not. Maybe they would.

I don't know if I told you about this or not - this old lady that lived in Rockland, and she had this boy that she had taken care of all his life. It was the only child she had and she always took care of him. He was mentally retarded and like that, and he couldn't talk and couldn't do anything for himself. She looked after him until he was 18 years old, and she still fed him, washed him and dressed him and everything, and was getting pretty well along in years, until the town people suggested that she should have him placed and she didn't want to, but they did finally talk her into it. They committed him down there to Pineland, and he was there about a month, I guess. I don't know if he was there that long, but the boy did die, and I think they came to the conclusion that he died of homesickness. He was so attached to his mother; he knew his mother, and his being there, he got so after awhile he wouldn't eat. He was in bed all the time anyway. As I say he was a pretty big boy, and he got so she couldn't handle him, and her husband was dead. She was a widow. So he did die, and when they notified her about it she felt pretty sad.

I think that if a child is a little bit backward in school, but he don't seem to get enough attention, or something, that they could put him into a class with children of the same caliber. Then if they did, he'd have more confidence in himself, and he would probably start getting rehabilitated. He shouldn't be sent to Pineland. Of course, we had some down there that came and I guess that could have had something done for them if it had been started right away. But it seems that they waited too long, and as they started associating with some of the others, well, then they got to be the same way. We had an employee down there, and he was an ordinary normal person, but you'd never know it after three or four years, because his being there, working there, he got so he acted almost like some of the patients. I mean in motions and things that he did.

I feel that I wasn't getting exactly like they were, but I felt that I might be, I might, sometimes I suppose, get that way, by seeing what happened to some of the others.

When I was at Pineland my feelings were that once I was there I'd never get a chance ever to get out, because I knew that I really had no relatives that cared for me - but I do have relatives around - but they don't know me exactly, because my father never visited - he wasn't a man who visited his family too, too much, and so I don't really know them and they don't know me, so my being there I felt I never would get out.

At the beginning when I got out I doubted myself. It hasn't stayed with me to any extent. It might have a little bit. I mean it takes....the longer you've been there the harder it is, but had you been there only a few years and come out, I guess a person would get adjusted faster.

I don't make any plans in advance because I've had so many disappointments before in making plans in advance - I find that in making my plans in advance I've always had disappointments and that's why I started doing it this way - just went along and took everything as it come. I find I get along better that way.

***

Three accounts of interview visits follow. Described are dischargees who are functioning at an extremely retarded level, and who had been at Pineland between 1950 and 1960. In each case, after brief institutionalization, the child had been removed by the parents or foster parent. As the Hayden Infirmary (specifically designed and staffed for this type of child) had not been constructed at Pineland until late 1961, the lack of facilities and care for these children at that earlier time is reflected in parental attitudes.

These cases in themselves provide interesting comparisons of attitudes toward retardates at a quite similar level. With George Fielding, the family situation suggests home care through a sense of duty alone. With Donald Morin, duty and affection seem equally combined. In the last case, of Arthur Robichaud, the burdensome sense of duty seems altogether absent, and a higher purpose takes its place -- inspired by an ideal that would seem to be applicable to all levels of retardation.

GEORGE FIELDING

Born 1947. Admitted in 1956 at age 9, for an institutional stay of only 10 months. Mongolism. Vineland SMQ of about 10. Having "tried out rejection", the parents were overcome with feelings of guilt and took the child home. The interviewer's account follows:

The Fieldings live in a modest bungalow in South Brandeford, located fairly close to Cambridge Paper Co., where Mr. Fielding is still employed. The only other sibling still living at home is Janet, 22, a rather attractive, dark-haired woman, who said she had been away at school until about three or four years ago. Mrs. Fielding was presently in New York and there was a middle-aged housekeeper who seems to be employed on a part-time basis as needed.

George was sitting on the floor of the living room in front of the television. It looked as though he had a nursing bottle in his mouth which was as good an indication as any of his mental level. He is as wide as he is high, giving him a roly-poly, infantile appearance. Speech development is nil, but he emits rather loud noises which are more animal-like than the usual sound an infant makes. Janet says that George used to say three or four single words, but even this slight achievement has been absent since her return home. He is almost totally dependent, except for being able to drink out of a glass. Motor coordination is good; he is steady on his feet, and his manual dexterity is such that Janet believes he could feed himself with a spoon if it were not for having been spoonfed for so long. When a spoon is placed in his hand, he will bang it down on the table and wait to be fed. George is dressed, bathed, and shaved by the family. He is not toilet-trained and has absolutely no control, wetting and soiling wherever he may be at the moment. Stuffed animals are his favorite toys but they get rather rough treatment at times. His father is the only one in the family who can discipline him and Janet thinks that her parents have been too lax with him in this regard.

Mrs. Fielding seems to be the only one in the family who has held out against institutionalization because she feels his care is her "obligation". Presumably, the family has done some investigating of outside resources, since they are aware that George will be eligible for AD in one year when he will be eighteen. Since, of course, there are no community facilities for those lower than trainables, his care is a 24-hour proposition.

He sleeps soundly about ten hours every night, "eats like a horse", and has had no health problems. Within the past year, Janet has noted more sex activity which goes somewhat beyond masturbation. Several times when being put to bed, he has shown some sexual aggressiveness (pushing her onto the bed), but in view of the intimate care he is receiving from the females in the family, this behavior, even when given an adult interpretation, is surprisingly mild.

George is emotionally sensitive to any extra noise in his environment, as when there are visitors in the home or TV shows in which fighting or other violent activity occurs, he jumps around and shows quite frenzied activity. Although he sways much of the time, he also responds to different musical tempos -- likes music and watches television from morn to night. He likes to play with his little nephews and nieces, but because of his size and over-excitability, he has to be watched closely and is probably not allowed much association with them. What social experience he has is necessarily limited to relatives, as most people are afraid of him.

He has put his hand through some of the windows, destroyed furniture, and is quite generally destructive in a manner which seems in part an expression of rage, but often only an accompaniment to his over-activity. He is not very aggressive towards people now, other than occasional pushing or pinching.

Quite obviously, a boy as severely handicapped as George, has been a source of controversy within the family and a strain on all concerned. Were it not for guilt and sentimentality, he would probably have been left at PSS or placed in some other institution at an early age. The greatest tragedy in this situation, to my mind, though, is what I think was indicated by Janet when, after I had identified myself, she pointed to George and said, "Oh, you came about him." "Him" represented hardly more than a thing or an object. There is, therefore, nothing to alleviate the burden he represents, no personality to identify with and love....really nothing for them to cling to as making their sacrifices worthwhile.

***

DONALD MORIN

Born 1946. Admitted 1960 at age 14, and discharged 3 months later. Severe brain injury and epilepsy. The Vineland SMQ of ca. 2 is probably too low. The interviewer's account follows:

Chestnut Street is adjacent to the Municipal Hospital in Morganton. The Morins have the bottom floor of a grey shingled house, one of the better looking homes on the street.

Mrs. Morin is an attractive blond woman, probably in her early forties. She stated that she had just returned from the hospital the week before. Her hubby is a kindly dark-haired man with a pleasant sense of humor. Both these people speak with a thick French accent and probably converse with each other mainly in that language.

Donald Morin is a boy of eighteen who is confined to a wheel chair which he and his father call "the Cadillac." He is completely disabled physically and needs attention for all his personal needs. He has the size of an eleven or twelve year old. Donny speaks in single words and is able to communicate quite well. He is convulsive, and, according to his mother, he has two or three seizures a month. He takes four types of anti-convulsive medicine daily and several other kinds of medication.

Mrs. M. has been acting as an around-the-clock nurse since the boy returned home in 1960. It is impossible to get a baby-sitter and, hence, Donny is never left alone in the house. Mrs. M. has established a routine for all aspects of his care and seems to handle everything quite efficiently.

Donny is fond of watching television and listening to the radio. His mother reported that he was especially fond of quiz and musical programs. Mrs. M. felt that Donny knew what was happening on these programs a great deal of the time. I noted that Donny seemed to understand a part of our conversation.

Mr. & Mrs. Morin felt that Donald was not happy at PSS and, thus, decided to care for him at home. According to Mrs. M., he was in the hospital for the entire stay. Here, he got little personal attention, refused to eat, and cried all the time.

Donny is completely accepted by his parents, and they seemed to have moulded their lives around him and his needs. This is a tremendous sacrifice on their part since they are not able to leave the house together, go on a trip, or do any of the things people normally do.

Mrs. M. expressed their feeling quite well when she said they felt that Donny had been cheated out of life anyway, and they wanted to make his life as pleasant as possible. If he had been happy at PSS, then he would have remained there. Since he was not, they felt that he deserved a little happiness and undertook his care themselves. They intend to keep him until an emergency arises or until Donny needs the constant care of a nurse and doctor.

The Morins get a modest AD check each month for Donny. Mr. M. stated that his medical expenses range from $20 - $25/week. Other items also have placed a heavy financial burden on this LM couple.

***

ARTHUR ROBICHAUD

Born 1938. Admitted 1950 at age 11, and one month later went out on lengthy prolonged visit with foster mother. Formally discharged in 1958. Blind and severely retarded. Vineland SMQ of ca. 10.

Patient had come under Health and Welfare custody at age 4, and had boarded with a Mrs. Maynard since that time. In 1950 H&W had placed him at Pownal State School (now Pineland) but his foster mother had been so distrubed by conditions that she took him home again with her and maintained him at her own expense from 1950 to 1958. In 1958 Aid to the Blind was obtained for the patient, and later, Social Security.

The adverse conditions described at the school were those that existed before Dr. Bowman became Superintendent of Pineland. The interviewer's account follows:

The community of Titus is so small that I drove past it twice without realizing it, then finally saw the tiny post office and got direction to Mrs. Maynard's house which was just around the corner.

This is a small, but rather sprawling old one-story farm house with a shed attached to the main house, as well as a half-finished room which belongs exclusively to Mrs. Maynard's daughter, Wilma. In spite of the fact that Mrs. Maynard is 81 and only recently up and about from a heart attack, the house was meticulously clean and neat.

Mrs. Maynard is so warm and friendly that I was made to feel instantly at home. We got right down to cases with no need for explanations or polite chit-chat. She wanted to tell me straight off that she had no use for PSS and the care (or lack of it) afforded patients here. Joey, as Arthur is called, was here only a month due to Mrs. M.'s insistence through Dr. Merrill, that she take him home, the stipulation being that she would take full responsibility. Joey was in bad condition when she got him back as she doesn't believe he was cleaned up from BM's during the entire month he was here. She mentioned seeing the children lined up and marching to the dining rooms with men herding them along with sticks in their hands and showers which consisted of using a hose on patients en masse. This was horrifying to Mrs. M.'s strong and maternal nature. No matter what may happen to Joey after her death, she wanted assurance that he would not be returned here.

Mrs. Maynard accepts philosophically the imminence of her death, but she is very worried about what will happen to Joey and her 62-year old daughter, Wilma, who is a deaf mute. She cannot understand why it is so difficult to find an elderly pensioner who would not want to live at her house and care for these two, very dependent individuals, especially with the inducement of Joey's Social Security of $75 per month. A neighbor of hers, in her seventies, who runs a motel next door, has shown some interest but Mrs. M. is skeptical of her motives. She feels that this woman's only interest is in business expansion and that once she had acquired the property, Wilma would be dumped. Regarding Joey, Mrs. M. has been in communication with a boarding home in Trafton; the proprietor has promised to pay her a call but, so far, this has not materialized. Mrs. M. was relieved to learn that Joey (IQ 10 at PSS) would probably be eligible for welfare funds in addition to his SS to pay for boarding or nursing home care. She felt that he could be happy in most any situation where he received proper attention. Mrs. M., after a suggestion from me, plans to acquaint the town officials with her wishes for Joey in the event that she should die suddenly.

Wilma's future seems more of a problem because she prefers the life of recluse and is used to being catered to by her mother, who brings meals to her, empties her waste, does her laundry, and allows her to "lead her own life" within this limited context. In a boarding home where she would be sharing a room and subject to rules and regulations, Wilma would probably be very unhappy. Mrs. M. is keenly aware of this and hopes that Wilma can continue to live in her "little house" under the care of a responsible adult.

This situation with Wilma appears rather unique and unconventional. Her room (or little house) is a semi-finished affair beyond the shed which consists of a bed, some nondescript old chairs and table which take up most of the available space, but there are several windows which give good ventilation and ingeniously, Mrs. M. has enclosed a good-sized oil stove with wire and padlock so that she can tend the fire and keep Wilma from tampering with it. Here Wilma "rules the roost" and has the obvious satisfaction of ownership. About two months ago she replaced Wilma's old bed with a brand new one which so delighted her daughter that while the men were unloading it, she had danced around hugging herself, clapping her hands, and showing by every means possible, her gleeful rapture. Now the first thing Wilma does when she has callers is to strip the bed so that she can show off her proudest possession.

Mrs. M. says that once a year on Christmas Day, Wilma comes to the main house with her basket of presents, but this is the only time she offers to enter the house. Outwardly she shows no reaction at all to Joey, but ignores him altogether. Whether her self-imposed isolation is due entirely to her handicap or there is some jealousy involved here is not known by Mrs. M. It would seem that some people in the community are critical of Mrs. M. for her handling of Wilma and it might be argued that more effort should have been made along social lines, but this does not seem to be rejection by Mrs. M. She is indulgent without being smothering toward either Wilma or Joey, who, in their own way, are allowed maximum latitude of being themselves. My own feeling is that it takes a remarkable degree of maturity and understanding to have this tolerance and regard for their individuality. It is a compliment to them as well as Mrs. M. who becomes quite amused at some of the concern expressed by various people. (Mostly over how she has managed certain personal, hygiene problems of Wilma's!) Mrs. M. went into a paroxysm of laughter when telling me of someone (probably a social worker) who had wondered if Joey was a "sex problem." I think the key to her success with these two severely handicapped people is her delightful and penetrating sense of the ridiculous and her keen use of humor. She is a completely uninhibited woman who doesn't appear to be hampered by any neurotic ruminations!

Almost from the start of our visit, Mrs. M. was anxious for me to see Joey and what "a big man" he was. She finally found him in the bathroom and steered him into the living room where he sat motionless during the entire time. Joey is as wide as he is high. She lifted an arm to show his biceps off. He is very short, hardly over 5 feet, if that, but weighs over 200 lbs. (again obesity equated with ever-lovin' care). He is totally blind and so severely retarded that he has the cherubic look of an over-grown infant. All day he sits contentedly in a rocking chair with his feet propped up on another chair and a blanket over his legs. Just before his meals he ritualistically goes to the bathroom, then takes his seat at the kitchen table where he is able to feed himself with a spoon. Mrs. M. has taught him to say a few single words to specific questions, such as, "What do we eat for supper on Saturdays?" Joey answers, "Beans." At night after Mrs. M. tucks him in, he says, "Mama, Goodnight." Other than these parrot-like responses, he has no verbal ability. He was taught to walk many years ago by one of Mrs. M.'s boarders, and he is completely toilet-trained, although Mrs. M. cannot teach him to wipe himself, nor can she teach him to fold his napkin after eating. Except for the fact that he is rough with toys and breaks them all eventually, he is not destructive, obeys very well, and shows only slight temper from time to time.

Once when Mrs. M. was in the hospital for three weeks and her aunt had to take care of him, he did show more temper, threw his food at the door and shook the screen door. The minute he heard Mrs. M.'s voice when she got home, he clapped his hands as a sign of happiness. I was completely amazed at how long Joey could sit still without showing any discontent but probably he needs very little stimulation at this low level. After Mrs. M. and I had returned from "visiting" Wilma, I saw that Joey had gone to his favorite chair and was sitting there with his legs propped up and the blanket over his legs. This is how he spends his days. Once a month a barber comes to the house to cut his hair; Mrs. M. shaves him every other day. He never ventures outside the house.

Just as Mrs. M. predicted, Wilma drew all the bed clothing away from one end of the bed when Mrs. M. and I came into her "house." She was all smiles and pleased as could be. After we had admired her bed, she covered her face with an envelope or something because of her extreme shyness, but she is not afraid of strangers which perhaps supports the idea that she is a recluse by choice and not primarily motivated by fear. Mrs. M. says that sometimes Wilma will take her by the arm to the door of her room, indicating that she doesn't want company. Wilma is much more intelligent than Joey, but I would think she is quite retarded. She does carry clothes in from the line, rakes leaves, makes her bed, and probably cleans her room by herself. She is also short and heavy but appears to be good-natured if somewhat strong-willed.

Mrs. M. says Wilma was at the School for the Deaf in Majorport as a young child for a short time and at some other institution, but was so homesick that Mrs. M. had brought her home.

It is interesting that Mrs. M. was brought up in a foster home from about the age of two to sixteen. A picture of her foster mother was prominently displayed and she seemed to have only the warmest regard for her. Mrs. M. was divorced from her first husband and has been a widow for 20-25 years, having married for the second time to a much older man. She is on the best of terms with Hubby #1, who, together with his present wife, paid her a visit recently. She said he is 86 now and very ill. He had said "Good-bye" to her in such a manner of finality that Mrs. M. knew he expected to die soon.

Many years ago Mrs. M. had run a boarding home for young art students in Medukmok. Sometimes she cooked for as many as fifty people at a meal. These are fond memories she has of a life which must have been filled with excitement and laughter. Mrs. M. may well have lifted many an eyebrow in her day, but perhaps because she has lived such a full life, she speaks of her own death in a calm, undramatic manner which made it very easy to try to help her plan for the future care of Wilma and Joey.

***

Above the level of almost total physical dependence, there are those with capacities that permit more effective social functioning but not self support. The elderly constitute one such group, and Old Age Assistance payments have made possible their placement in the community. With some of these, the capacities had always been severely limited. Others had much higher ability but a lifetime of institutionalization - heritage of an earlier philosophy - had hampered fuller expression. With all, declining physical powers have imposed additional limitations.

Three accounts of elderly dischargees follow. The first describes a boarding home and several dischargees. The other two describe individuals.

THE WARDWELL FARM

This boarding home is located in a rather remote and economically declining area of Maine. In addition to dischargees, it also houses a certain number of patients out on prolonged visit status. The dischargees described are all quite limited. The interviewer's account follows:

The Wardwell Farm in Rogerston is a large white building, freshly painted and in particularly good condition. Here, Mr. Wardwell's boarders come for the weekends to enjoy the out-of-doors, weed the gardens, and feed the horses. Mr. Wardwell is in the process of opening the farm as a boarding home. He showed me numerous improvements he had made in order to equip it to meet state regulations. (The main boarding home is in neighboring Thuleport.)

Ex-pts. Diamond Morgan and Ed Tibbets were sitting on the porch of this establishment. They are 78 and 80 years old respectively and two of the least active boarders that Mr. Wardwell has. Both seem to be in good health, fond of chewing tobacco. They are able to dress themselves but unable to shave or pick up their rooms.

Diamond Morgan barely speaks. His voice resounds faintly and sounds are blurred by a speech defect. Diamond is now almost totally blind and the other boarders take him by the hand when he ambulates. He is particularly fond of his tobacco and television programs.

Ed Tibbets, now eighty years old, is a feeble old gent with a winsome smile. He has a slight speech defect and walks with difficulty. Both these men refer to Mr. Wardwell as Dad and display much affection towards him.

The main boarding home of the Wardwells houses some fifteen ex-PHTC and PHTC patients. It is a large, white, colonial structure on the main street of the town. Red shutters adorn the windows, and a long porch extends the width of the building. In the yard there are several park benches where the boarders sit when the weather is favorable.

Martha Lowell is a tiny, thin lady with snow-white hair. Every so often she lets out a high shrill laugh at nothing in particular. She speaks quite clearly and appears to be a sturdy, healthy, seventy-one-year-old lady. Her sister Violet is here with her and according to the Wardwells, the two girls are inseparable. All the Lowell girls, including Iris, have been fond of doing simple chores about the house. In 1964, Iris entered the Thuleport hospital at the orders of the Public Health Nurse. Here, she remains, according to Mr. Wardwell, in rather serious condition following the collapse of a lung as the result of a recurring TB infection. Neither of the sisters have visited her, but both are waiting anxiously for her return. If Iris's health permits, she will move to a nursing home in Moriah. All the Lowell girls, stated Mrs. Wardwell, have rather violent tempers, and Iris was, during the last year, particularly ill-tempered.

Inside the boarding home, the rooms are large, and contain no more than two to a room. The home which the Wardwells provide is a very warm one. Mr. Wardwell is a kindly Yankee man who is at all times dignified and gentlemanly. The boarding home business seems to appeal to his fatherly-grandfatherly desires, and to replace the children who are now grown up. He takes a warm interest in the boarders as people and individuals. He tries to remember something each one of them especially likes. This is a marked contrast to the Slade boarding home also in Thuleport. There, although the physical care was good, Mr. Slade seemed to view the PHTC patients mainly as dollar signs.

While Mr. Wardwell is a shrewd business man, he is also honest and fair. He is also a man who expresses sadness regarding Thuleport's decline, disgust regarding the town's youth, and stubborness regarding his eventual retirement.

This seems a happy placement for the four ex-pts now present and for the fifth when she was present. All seem to respond to this home-like supportive environment, which the Wardwells provide.

***

CARROLL WELLS

> Born 1890. Admitted to Pownal State School in 1933 at age 43. Discharged in 1959 at age 68, after 25 years of institutional life. An academically oriented Revised Binet in 1933 placed his IQ at 67. In the 1950's a WB-I and a WAIS placed his IQ in the 92 - 99 range.
>
> Crippled in infancy by polio, this patient had functioned fairly capably before admission, doing work on his father's farm and janitor work for a church. Following his father's death in 1930, beneficent town officials engineered his institutionalization. At Pownal he worked on the road crew. At discharge he was considered to be not retarded but of normal intelligence. The interviewer's account follows:

Vesuvius is a tiny village consisting of some large farms, a railroad stop (no longer used), and a general store. It is a hilly region filled with forest area. I was directed to the Littles by a fatherly New Yorker, who had left the great metropolis for some country air. He is now in the process of selling his farm as he has found country life a little too quiet.

Upon reaching the Little home, I was greeted by a smiley, 6'5", bearded man, dressed in high boots and hunting clothes. He said "the old gentleman" was in the house reading. He apologized for the state of the house and said his wife had been away for a few days.

The house was middle-classy, but presently in a state of chaos and quite dirty. I found Carroll engrossed in a Zane Grey western. He is an elderly sort, about 75 - 80ish, with kind, blue eyes. He greeted me warmly. Carroll has been receiving OAA since discharge. He uses part of this to pay his room and board. He originally lived with Mr. Little's mother in Newbury and moved to Vesuvius when she died. He saw his father occasionally before he died in '62.* Carroll lives a quiet life reading and taking care of his pet chickens.

He spoke slowly in Yankee style, much like Mr. Little. Carroll fondly recalled his PSS days and seemed to feel it was his real home. Like Ethel Beecher, he was often sorry he ever left. Carroll seems to be very alert and to be of at least average intelligence. His disposition is placid. He is fond of the Littles, and Mr. Little seemed very fond of him. The latter appears to treat him with respect, and seemed quite in awe of "all his reading". He said that they make frequent trips to "the city" for books.

---

*Mr. Little's father

Carroll asked about the location of a patient whom he took care of at PSS. He said he would like to write to him or if possible, see him. He also recalled how he used to "write letters for everyone on Sundays."

Mr. Wells is functioning well; has no problem save a slight physical disability and old age. He no doubt would have, in middle age, been capable of self-support.

***

AMY WILLIAMS

Born 1894. Admitted in 1909 at age 14. Out on prolonged visit in 1960 at age 65, following a 50 year institutional stay, and discharged in 1961. A 1913 Revised Binet placed the IQ at 57. Scores on a 1958 WAIS were: Verbal 74, Performance 83, Full Scale 76.

Early background was very obscure. She was at the State School for Girls (a correctional institution) by age 10, shipped out on two juvenile work placements and then with little or no explanation sent to the Maine School for the Feeble-Minded (Pineland's original title). Here she did kitchen and waitress work for 50 years. Life overwhelmed the socially marginal parents and communication with them ended by 1916.

This interview provides valuable observations on facilities for the aged:

Amy is 70 now, bothered with arthritis and diabetes but still quite spry for her age. She has a very emphatic way of expressing herself, almost blows herself up like a balloon before declaring herself, becoming quite emotional and tending to assume that any action towards her which is contrary to her wishes is therefore hostile. At the same time, she is quick to respond to kindness and friendliness. She enjoys good-natured banter, alert to the give and take this requires. Her more positive qualities seem to have come to the fore in this present home because Mrs. Verrill is herself an engaging person with sympathy and an understanding of the needs of old people.

Our ex-pt. has been with Mrs. Verrill since April of '63 (she has a very clear memory for specific dates). A potentially unhappy situation was averted last December when Mrs. Verrill sold her nursing home and turned an adjoining building into an apt. house. Because Amy and another elderly boarder were so disturbed by this disruption, Mrs. Verrill decided to keep them with her. (Mrs. Verrill is now employed by a new nursing home in Westborough, on the night shift.)

Mrs. Verrill ran her nursing home for over twenty years but the more stringent welfare regulations, the need for major renovations and expensive equipment, forced her out of business. At one time she had had forty patients but was cut down to around twenty-three which she said was scarcely enough to meet expenses, and the expense of putting in a sprinkler system would have been more costly than the building was worth. There is a new section which faces the street but the older part of this house is quite rundown. It is the older section in the back - some eighteen rooms - which she held onto and is now in the process of converting into apartments. Amy, Mrs. Sherwood, who is a 93-year old boarder, Mrs. Verrill, and her father are the only occupants of the building at present.

Mrs. Verrill has strong feelings about the modern emphasis on antiseptic, efficient, business-like management of nursing homes, for in the process she feels that the personal touch has been lost, that not enough account is paid to the old people who must live in these surroundings. Mrs. Sherwood was a good example of what she meant, for this old lady had furnished her room with old-fashioned but cherished items from her old home, and the new management had insisted that this furniture must be replaced with the new and uniform equipment they have installed. Progress at the expense of conformity is perhaps too high a price to pay when so little is left for these old people to call their own and when any tie with the past (even disharmonious furniture) has such emotional significance. Mrs. Verrill is a very articulate spokesman for the "old school" and pointed out important problems which must somehow be resolved in a situation which is unfortunately not all black and white.

Other boarders, not as fortunate as Amy and Mrs. Sherwood, had to be relocated after the sale of this property and there had been some sad moments which Mrs. Verrill has found difficult to resolve. It is perhaps inevitable that living so close to the nursing home, she finds much to criticize, but it is her contention that only the few patients of private means have any freedom to come and go (some are not bedridden and could go for walks, etc.) or pursue some personal interests.

Mrs. Verrill had had to have a kitchen built in the old section before her two boarders could move in, but she managed to get settled just before Christmas so that they could have a tree and traditional celebration. Such seemingly little things -- like Amy being able to have some neighborhood dog who has attached himself to her in her room during the day -- make the difference between merely existing and having an identity of her own. Amy, who has spent virtually a lifetime at PHTC, has found a niche for herself and seems reasonably happy here.

Our ex-pt. is a proud woman who, above all, must feel that she is now entitled to a pension as any other retired person. She had told Mrs. Verrill that she worked in our kitchen for fifty-one years, repeated this same thing to me with the air of a person who can now rest on her laurels, and it would certainly appear that there is much truth to this. Her resentment at Mrs. Weston who had boarded her for several years after her discharge, stems mainly from such feelings, I think, for she derisively stated that Mrs. Weston had "kicked her out" because she wasn't getting enough board money. (Mrs. Verrill gets the top at $110/mo. but this has probably been increased the last few years.)

Amy is on a strict diabetic diet and gets insulin once daily. She has pain from arthritis but she gets exercise by walking to the neighborhood stores or down to the beach which is perhaps a half-mile from the house so that she navigates without much difficulty. There has been no trouble from cataracts, and she sees well enough to do close embroidery work, an activity which particularly interests her. Mrs. Verrill takes her to Branford to get her sewing materials as Amy says that none of the stores in Plum Point carry such items. The size and abundance of goods in the larger stores tends to dazzle her to the extent that she overbuys. At the check-out counter, Mrs. Verrill stands by her to straighten things out, as Amy (who has $2/mo for incidentals) nonchalantly puts whatever money she has on the counter, informing the clerk that this is all she has regardless of how much the total may be. Although Amy is perfectly serious about it, her righteous indignation at some of the beach boys is rather humorous as she told me how once while walking along the street, a car load of young fellas had hollered at her, "How you doing, Babe?" Mrs. Verrill added later, not unkindly, that Amy's sense of propriety is shaken by other human excesses as she noted a mixed group under the influence and thought their behavior indicated they were not mentally quite bright.

Of course Amy's parents have been dead for many years and she has never heard from either of her siblings. Brother Al, she said, ran away from PSS in 1916. Her sister and she were both at the State School for Girls but there has never been any contact between them since then. Mrs. Verrill did not know much about Amy's background, but she realized what a lonely life our ex-pt. had had.

Amy is very fond of certain ones she knew at PHTC and loves to buy gifts for her friends. She writes regularly to several former patients. Her sympathy for one of these, now at Dirigo State Hospital, runs very deep, and she blames the former employers, says they worked her too hard.

About the only thing she holds against the hospital was our neglect to provide false teeth after we had extracted the originals. Otherwise, all she would say was that she was treated well and liked it here.

***

There are many retardates who are chronologically adults but not elderly, and for these, Aid to the Disabled, Social Security, and other possible sources pertain. Capable of self care but not self support, they can often be more readily maintained at home by their families through such sources.

In the large majority of such cases that we met, good to excellent adjustment was the rule. Of the three accounts cited below, the first is typical of such adjustment. The second case is presented to illustrate hardship in an economically deprived area, and to suggest the need for more community resources -- regional centers and consultation sources, etc. -- for the retarded and their families.

The third case is probably among the very worst encountered in this category -- or perhaps the family was seen at a worst moment, as all AD cases come under the supervision and review of a particular department of our State government. However, the need for specific community programs for the retarded and for a specific agency concerned exclusively with their welfare would seem to be indicated.

EMILY CALDWELL

> Born 1940. Admitted January 1953 at age 12, out on prolonged visit to her home one month later, but not formally discharged until 1959 at age 18. Mongolism, with some question as to absolute certainty of this diagnosis. A 1953 WISC indicated: Verbal 53, Performance 37, Full Scale 46.
>
> Domestic problems and the urging of local selectmen prompted the divorced mother to institutionalize Emily. The mother had hoped for special schooling but she was disillusioned by conditions at the institution; it was then without a superintendent, and none of the newer programs had yet begun. Emily was therefore taken home almost immediately. The mother subsequently remarried. The interviewer's account follows:

Emily and her mother and stepfather live on the outskirts of Greenvale on a dirt road about a quarter of a mile from the State Sanitorium. The Clark family has just returned from Arizona where they have been living for the last year and a half. They are presently rebuilding a rather decrepit house and living in a small, three-room trailer.

Emily, who has all the appearances of a mongoloid, was alone in the trailer when I arrived (save for a small black noisy dog). When one first encounters E., one is rather impressed with her social know-how. Her speech is rather thick but otherwise normal. E. seems to be able to handle familiar, practical situations quite well.

She cannot read or write, tell time, count money in large amounts, etc. E. had much difficulty re time, drawing blanks for quite awhile. She could, however, tell me everywhere that she had lived, and count the years by the summers. (This was still pretty much guess work.)

Emily has lived with her mother and stepfather since discharge. Prior to the move to Arizona, the family was living year round in Maine, in a nearby town. Now they plan to spend summers in Maine and winters in Arizona.

Emily does quite a bit of housekeeping for her mother and was operating the vacuum cleaner when I arrived. She also enjoys painting glasses and trays (her mother has helped her learn this), television, and music of all kinds.

She is bubbling over with affection, especially for her parents. One has the impression that family ties are particularly strong. Emily is much more independent than any others of her intellectual level I have seen. This could perhaps be attributed to family support. For one thing, Emily seems to be given much freedom to try things and explore. She travels into town by herself and is alone frequently (compared with a somewhat similar mongoloid dischargee, Karen Peters, who colors all day and is not allowed out of her house & yard - the difference being, Karen seems to socialize at the level of a five-year-old and Emily a sixteen-year-old). Emily may, of course, be of potentially higher level as there was some doubt of mongolism at PHTC.

Emily stated that she receives an AD pension of $64/mo. This money is handled by her mother, and Emily is given a small amount of spending money weekly.

This girl will probably never be capable of employment, except perhaps light housework in a sheltered domicile.

***

LEONARD SHADWELL

Born 1935. Admitted in 1959 at age 24, out on prolonged visit to his home one year later, and discharged in 1961. Stanford Binet IQ in 1959 of 34; Goodenough and HTP scores of 49 and 52.

After an apparent suicide attempt by this boy, a local physician had advised institutionalization. The move was made by the family with some reluctance; the father was invalided at this time by a progressive illness, and the family in reduced circumstances.

At Pineland, the boy, who was a product of home sheltering, was timid, nervous, hypochondriacal, and homesick. AD payments permitted return to his home. The conditions of economic decline in this geographically rather isolated part of Maine are tellingly described in the interviewer's account which follows:

The approach to Thuleport is a mixture of beauty and decay. On the side of beauty one sights Nehantic Bay, flanked by the mountains of New Brunswick. The landscape in Thuleport area is particularly vulnerable as there are few trees or the like to protect it from the sea. The land is, for the most part, flat. It is extremely rocky, barren of vegetation, and populated by various dead and dying trees. The town itself appears to have rotted along with the greenery. The buildings, which are mostly of wood, are warped and decayed. In the Main Street area, colors are somber. The stores, about half of which are abandoned, display broken windows and other states of destruction. Fire has leveled several buildings, but the ruins remain. Unlike Kolberg, the residential areas are devoid of even one prosperous looking home. As one travels the narrow streets one sees broken windows, broken doors, cracked roofs, and dilapidated homes. On the main street, the men of the town, seemingly unemployed, gather on the street corner to talk over the events of the day. The going attitudes seem to be ones of resignation and bitterness. Some expressed little hope of work while others have now ceased to look for it. Out of the overwhelming decay has been born more decay - laziness and bitterness.

Mrs. Harold Shadwell lives on the South Side of the town in a residential area which has fallen apart. There is no paint left on her home, the door is battered, and some of the windows broken. On the inside things are a little dirty but efforts have been made to provide a home-like atmosphere. Mrs. Shadwell, a brown-haired, tired, pudgy woman, sat holding her son's hand. She was extremely nervous, almost desperate, in her attitude towards him. She stated that her husband had died a year and a half ago. Most of her children were grown and Len was all she had "left in life." Len, who is quite low, appears to be retarded on first glance. He has a slight speech defect, is convulsive, and must be cared for by his mother. These two, according to the townsfolk, are inseparable companions.

Len is unable to read or write. He cannot make change or tell time and spends his days in the company of his mother or watching TV. He is able to take care of his own personal needs, shave himself, and with direction pick up his own room.

Following the death of his father, he had a series of convulsions. It is now necessary for him to take dilantin t.i.d. Len usually has one petit mal seizure a month.

Len seems genuinely fond of his mother. Despite her rather over-anxious motherhood, there seem to have been few problems. Loss of his mother in the future might be a traumatic event for Len and produce great problems. The town seems to be rather sympathetic toward Len, as it is toward other ex-PHTC's in the area. He seems to be fully accepted as a town character. Storekeepers watch to see that he is not ridiculed by the younger men who are often in the downtown area with time on their hands.

***

ARTHUR CHAPEL

Born 1932. Admitted 1946 at age 13. On trial visits (working placements) beginning in 1955, and discharged in 1960 at age 28. Stanford Binet IQ's are in the 36 - 42 range.

When this boy was 6, his wholly inadequate mother was sent to Women's Reformatory, and Arthur and a sister placed in a foster home under Health and Welfare custody. Problems of adolescence and public school dismissal precipitated institutionalization. At Pineland Arthur was well behaved, "tried hard", but was very lacking in judgement. Trial visits were culminated with a successful two-year working placement on a farm, where he was closely and kindly supervised. After discharge however, he immediately left for the home of his remarried father. This family had at best always been socially marginal. The interviewer's account follows:

> I had called before at this apt. and a "lady" had answered the door stating that Arthur Chapel did not live there or anywhere in the building. This was verified by everyone else at home in the building. In this stop, however, the people adjacent to the apt. visited, stated that Arthur lived next door. My knock at the door produced a scurry. I could see that an attempt was made to hide a caseful of beer which was scattered all over the room. Then the same lady as before answered the door in a semi-intoxicated state and said she was Arthur Chapel's sister or sister-in-law. The lady then returned to the lap of a gentleman in the living room. Harry Chapel, the father, was lying prone on the couch in the same room.
>
> This apartment is a two-room job, extremely dirty and appears to be inhabited by various members of the Chapel family and guests. It is located in the cellar of an LB apartment building.
>
> People in the household seem to acquire their bread and wine from Harry Chapel's Soc. Security, Mark Chapel's unemployment, and Arthur Chapel's Social Security and AD pensions.
>
> Arthur Chapel is a short, good-looking young man of thirty-two. He is somewhat childlike, smiles continually, and seems to say 'yes' to every question posed. He does not appear to be alert mentally, and appears to function at a very low level. He cannot read or write and spends his days coloring and watching television. He does not go out unless accompanied by others. Arthur speaks softly and often slurs words together, so that, as a result, he is difficult to understand.
>
> Arthur left his farm placement one week after discharge and returned to his father and mother who were then living in Saintston. Except for occasional lawn-mowing jobs, he has not been employed since that time. The family feels he is incapable of work and has never encouraged him. He is probably capable only of very limited and strictly supervised employment.
>
> Both mother and father seem to have less than normal intelligence and to lead a rather undisciplined life. Arthur receives forty-eight dollars a month in Social Security-Mental Disability and sixty-four dollars a month A.D. One wonders how much of this money is used to buy booze.
>
> This is kind of a wild household (or appears to be) and is probably sometimes supportive and sometimes not, as the spirit moves everyone, especially Mom and Pop. Arthur seems to be in good health with the exception of rotten teeth which bleed almost constantly. Mother hopes to get them taken care of with additional welfare funds. Inquiries were made about daughter, Gladys Chapel, who is still at PHTC.

***

The death of one or both responsible parents creates serious problems for the very dependent retardate who has lived at home. Usually he is past the formative years when special therapeutic treatments might have been helpful, and for him institutionalization is not necessarily the only or the best course. An appropriate boarding home, with AD or other support, may provide most capably for his needs. Parental death and its aftermath are described in the case that follows.

SHERMAN DAVIS

Born 1926. Admitted in 1957 at age 31, out on prolonged visit with mother one month later, and formally discharged in 1960. Severe retardation and spastic diplegia of legs ascribed to birth injury. Stanford Binet IQ of 44 perhaps underrated him.

Sherman had always lived at home. His father died in 1940, and in 1957 his mother, an intelligent woman in her late sixties, was seriously ill with a heart condition, so Sherman was placed at Pineland on an emergency basis. Recovering somewhat, the mother took him home with her a month later; previously overprotected and sheltered, he had been quite homesick at Pineland. The interviewer's account follows:

After much confusion, due to misinformation given by a selectman of E. Hartsdale, it was discovered that Minnie Davis, mother of ex-pt. and postmistress of So. Hartsdale, died two years ago of heart disease. It was Mrs. Davis' desire that after her death, Sherman be placed in a boarding home rather than PHTC. She made arrangements to do this with Lawyer, Michael Alden, and despite the complaints of other relatives, this was accomplished. A month after her death in 1963, Sherman was moved to the newly established boarding home of Gladys Curtis in Chester. There followed irate protests of what Mrs. Curtis described as "a well meaning but not too understanding brother-in-law." This battle involved the selectmen of So. Hartsdale, who lined up on both sides of the issue. Mrs. Curtis and the desires of Mrs. Davis won out and Sherman has remained at the placement.

Sherman reacted strongly to the death of his mother and would cry at night for several months after her death. Now, he speaks of his mother fondly. Sherman is extremely handicapped physically. Until a year ago he was confined to a wheel chair, but now walks about dragging his feet with the aid of a walker. He is a nice looking man, although he cannot stand erectly, with brown hair and blue eyes. When he verbalizes he does not look at the addressee, but rather stares straight ahead into space. He is obsessed with the idea of returning to his home in Hartsdale. Mrs. Curtis has explained to him that the house was sold shortly after the death of his mother. Sherman, however, is saddened by this, and stated that he hoped to return someday to the house. Sherman shows signs of desiring more than he is capable of. His physical handicap frustrates him and he firmly believes that someday he will be able to walk normally. Mrs. Curtis attempts to point out to Sherman that his present progress is outstanding and downgrades his belief in full cure. Sherman told me that he is presently learning to drive. He hopes someday to learn to drive and stop, and through this skill to return to Hartsdale. Sherman is able to dress himself now and take care of his personal needs. He fondly calls Mrs. Curtis "Mother," as the rest of her boarders do. Mr. Alden stated that he has been very impressed with Sherman's progress at Mrs. Curtis's.

The home of Mrs. Curtis is located in New Chester, atop a hill. It is a large three-story home with abundant grounds. It is not in the best of conditions but does serve as a home for Mrs. Curtis, her father, and 17 PHTC and ex-PHTC patients. All of these people (the 17) are at a rather dependent level.

Mrs. Curtis is a hard looking, obese woman with dyed red hair. She appears to be rough talking and warm hearted, with lots of maternal drive. She has two grown sons, both of who are married. She seems at times, lonely - as if she is trying to fill up her life spaces with her boarders. At one time in her life she was a nurse or a practical nurse, but not until three years ago did she have any experience with or ever see anyone who was retarded. Mrs.

Curtis, nevertheless, seems to have a way with them. She has given some thought to her routine, given them, as well as herself, a family. She emphasizes sharing, non-violence, family cooperation. Everyone has a task - everyone has a talent. She disciplines firmly, showers affection. She stated that she could not begin to describe the things she has learned. G.C. is protective, and screens all visitors well.

Sherman has no visitors or correspondents, save a young woman who grew up next door to him. This lady, now married and living in R.I., visits twice a year, sends presents, and writes once a week. Sherman refers to this lady as his girlfriend. Sherman is fond of playing checkers and putting jig-saw puzzles together. He gets along with the other boarders well and rarely loses his temper. When he does it is usually directed at himself and seems to occur when he cannot live up to his expectations.

All in all, his adjustment at the boarding home seems to have been a good one. He seems to be getting impromptu physical therapy in addition to a warm and supportive situation. He receives disability from a V.A. pension of his late father and financially appears to be secure.

***

Another type of retardate whom AD and other kinds of support permit to live in a sheltered environment in the community is the long institutionalized patient.

HEWITT CONLEY

Born 1907. Admitted 1919, at age 12. First trial visit in 1953, discharge in 1959 at age 52. A 1953 WB gave IQ as: Verbal 103, Performance 86, Full Scale 94. A hunchback of rather small stature, this boy had apparently been of normal intelligence but was unloaded by a town poor farm onto MSFM. He became well institutionalized, was emotionally arrested at an 8 or 9 year old level, and his trial visit with the Eldridge family was more notable for personal adjustment than for work productivity. The interviewer's account follows:

The Eldridges live on a farm between Chadfield and East Chadfield. Their home is a good looking one in colonial style. The Eldridges take in elderly people to board as their farming is now very limited.

Mrs. E. is a tall, thin Puritan lady, very reserved, and undoubtedly strong as a rock. Mr. E., also a Puritan type, looks older and is less reserved.

The Eldridges are very fond of "Mickey." He has been with them for twelve years - some seven years on a TV. Mickey does odd chores for them but is not really employed. Mickey was discharged on AD. The Eldridges refused this until last Sept. when they found they would be ahead financially if he did receive it.

Mickey is a good-natured man with a hunch back who stated that he had been at PSS for some forty years. He is quite verbal and gossipy. He recollects PSS during the war years when the pts. had keys because of a shortage of employees. He seems to have held considerable responsibility while at PSS. He is somewhat child-like - probably the result of institutionalization and life-long dependency.

Mickey does not stray from the Eldridge land unless accompanied by them. He has no friends and has no idea where his relatives are. He seems more or less contented with this isolation. He lives with memories of PSS friends and past events.

The Eldridges stated that Mickey is extremely honest and there have been no sex problems. He works well but if unable to perform a task, will often "squeal like a pig." The Eldridges try to be understanding in these cases, tell him to come in and sit down and try it again tomorrow.

Mickey is forgetful about little things; turning off lights, etc. Mrs. E. stated this was the first year he has not frozen the water in the barn for the winter. His grooming habits are poor and he has to be forced to take a bath. Mrs. Eldridge adds, however, that Mickey has many fine qualities. They are careful about talking in front of Mickey or of giving him any idea that he is not normal.

Mrs. E. states that Mickey reads "all the time" - westerns, mysteries, but not the Post." He is wonderful with children and often neighbors let him take their children around the farm. Mickey understands money well and can make change with ease. Mickey's money is, however, handled by a lawyer in a nearby town.

This situation seems to be a happy one. Mickey is treated like a child in this home and is genuinely liked. The long institutionalization here seems to be supported by the present "family" set up. It is undoubtedly the only way this ex-pt. could have survived life in the outside world after forty years of institutionalization.

***

Another group not economically self supporting is comprised of the young. For these, depending on the individual capacities and their development, self support may or may not lie ahead. The fairly recent establishment of special classes in public schools, particularly for the educable, allows for much better social development and easier movement into productive adult lives than does lengthy institutionalization. Where feasible, the younger retardate need not come to the institution, or may be returned from it to the community.

PAUL O'MALLEY

Born 1951. Admitted in 1956 at age 5. Out on prolonged visit with parents in 1960, and discharged in 1961 at age 10. A battery of tests in 1960 placed his IQ in the 55 to 60 range.

Chronic brain syndrome hyperactivity combined anxiety-ridden maternal non-control to produce, by age 5, a thoroughly ungovernable child with an attention span measured in seconds. A private school could not manage him, but in his subsequent stay at Pineland he improved rapidly. The interviewer's account follows:

This fourteen-year-old boy in the middle range of retardation is still progressing very well. He is extremely tall (5'11") for his age, not yet filled out, but except for rather prominent lips, he does not look retarded and behaves even less so. Like boys of his age, he contradicts or corrects adults, produces bits and pieces of factual information, and gets a little wise at times, but though it grates on the nerves, this seems to me nothing more than the usual growing pains and further indicates that he is on an equal basis in the family, particularly as this relates to Celia Anne, the only sib and just one year his junior.

Celia becomes piqued at Paul when he acts superior towards her, remarked a number of times to me, "Just listen to him. Isn't he awful?" But this also seemed to cement the impression that Paul is holding his own. He has attended the Sanborn School (a public school for slow learners) each year since his discharge. At the outset, he was tried on half-sessions, but this was only during the first year. He now attends full time and has become very skillful at working with his hands. His woodworking is particularly good as demonstrated by the many objects he has made about the house, but he also weaves baskets and makes pot-holders. He has, as well, responded to academic training and can read, write, spell, and do simple arithmetic, not up to boys of his age, says his mother, but nearly so.

Paul, who is not at all bashful, wanted to know if PHTC had received the many baskets of toys which the school children had made up and sent to them. He brought out an 8x10 glossy showing the kids, including himself, at work on the project. Paul is enthusiastic about school, gets up very early in the morning so as not to be late, and walks to school about an hour before class is scheduled. During the summer (and his mother laughed at this) he is a lazy bones and usually sleeps until eleven. Much of the problem with Paul - his over-activity - has been effectively channeled both at school and home. His mother wracks her brains to think of things for him to do. He collects coins, paints by the numbers, and had painted the ceiling in the living-room, besides continuing with the skills he has learned at school. During the interview he was rather fidgety, had to keep his hands moving, but he was nonetheless attentive and engaged in the conversation. He and his sister share the same playmates in the neighborhood and there is an Aunt who takes the whole family for outings and motor trips. (The O'Malleys do not have their own car.)

Mrs. O'Malley plays the maternal role in a very low key or so it would appear. She acts much more like an older sister to her children and they respond to her at this level. There is a lot of banter between them, use of teenage slang, etc. When I asked her age (44) she quipped to her daughter that, "Now, she knew!" I don't know what the thinking on this may be, but it made them seem warm and close with neither youngster acting undisciplined. Their mother is a very natural, quick to get acquainted sort of person who makes you feel within a very short time that she is an old friend. Paul contributes to this easy atmosphere whether by intent or not, I don't know, but he comes out with some rather humorous remarks. When his mother started out to the kitchen to put on the coffee, Paul made the dry observation that I would get instant coffee. After his mother rebuked him a little, he said that any other company they had always get Instant. Later, there were similar remarks that I was being honored with their best china, etc.

Celia Anne is a sweet-appearing little girl who goes to one of the Catholic Schools in Majorport. She seems to be at the stage where she is interested in careers, asked me about social work and said she wanted to become a doctor. She excused herself for watching me so closely while I was filling out the questionnaire, but she is interested in everything, asked a few questions about the number of people I had interviewed, etc.

Now that there is no longer an R.R. station in Portland (fa. was a baggage & mail handler), Mr. O'Malley cancels mail at the P.O. This work is rather boring to him, but he has had to be assigned light duties because of his health (partial removal of stomach requiring several operations). He was recuperating at home for some time and Mrs. O'Malley got a job in one of the employee cafeterias in a downtown store to help with expenses. During the summer she stays home to look after Paul, but I think she plans to go back to work in the Fall.

When Paul reaches sixteen, he can no longer attend Sanborn, and Mrs. O'Malley was anxious to know whether it was age 16 or 18 before her son could go into a sheltered workshop there in Majorport. It seems vitally important to her that there be no great time lapse and certainly in view of the gains he has made, this seems reasonable. Paul says that you go to school part of the time, work the rest. He brightened up, said he would like to work in a car wash.

This boy has the desire and the confidence to produce, and I think that he may well be able to support himself in time.

***

Further along the road toward full independence, there is a sizeable group of male and female dischargees who to a greater or lesser degree are economically self supporting but otherwise quite socially dependent on a particular household: This may consist of parents, relatives, friends, or employers -- all of whom serve more or less in parental roles. It is as if the retardate were an adult child exempt from child labor laws but otherwise functioning at this junior level.

Characteristically, the earnings may be at a standard minimum wage level or may dip below that; the dischargee is domiciled with or very close to the responsible adult household, and he seeks and submits to rather close economic and social supervision or advice by the household. The household's relatives and friends are his also, whether actually or by "adoption," and his social relationships beyond this network may be quite limited.

The dozen cases that follow represent an illustrative sampling of different types of adjustment and support at the described level.

The first three cases are in various ways quite marginal in regard to self support. With Mavis Holliston, the move has been more or less from self-support to a rather responsible OAA setting. For Andrew Farrar, earnings are slight and family conditions are at a poverty level. Jennie Lyman functions as a domestic but might function equally well as an AD case.

MAVIS HOLLISTON

Born 1900. Admitted 1910 at age 9. First trial visit in a working situation in 1954, after 43 years of institutionalization. Discharge in 1960. A 1913 Revised Binet placed her IQ at 62. The IQ on a 1951 WB was Verbal 67, Performance 80, Full Scale 71.

The mother was probably mentally very limited, and an eccentric and mean spirited stepfather had Mavis placed in the City Poor Farm, which in turn sent her to MSFM. Rather curiously, the stepfather spent the rest of his life trying to get Mavis back again, but without success. The interviewer's account follows:

Mavis is a very short, stout woman in her mid-sixties - affable but rather nervous. She has been boarding with a widow of the same age for the past year. Mrs. Talbot is ailing, has some progressively incapaciting disease (MS) and is able to walk about just barely and painfully. Mrs. T. is a lonely woman, perhaps slightly neurotic over the state of her health, but warm, friendly, and affectionate towards our ex-pt. who runs errands within the house, acting as Mrs. T.'s "legs" in that respect. The affectionate regard for Mavis comes also from other relatives in this family - Mrs. T.'s mother and her nieces around the Cardiff area. Mavis's own relatives include only two aged and widowed aunts, but they both maintain an interest in her and write regularly.

Although an OAA recipient now, Mavis had several jobs following her discharge. She remained with Mrs. Fields in So. Majorport until that lady's death a year later. Then one of our former social workers, Mrs. Brady, employed her as a housekeeper about 18 months, until Mrs. B. went to Boston College for further training. Mavis was rather lukewarm about this job but only because there were four children who made her quite nervous. Mrs. B. took her to the hospital for a check-up (late 1963 or 1964), and an exploratory operation was performed which uncovered a small tumor (around the area of the breast) which was removed. There may be some question of a malignancy but the operation was minor requiring only two days at the hospital and a two month convalescence at the boarding home of Mrs. Northrup in So. Majorport.

Mrs. Northrup, knowing that Mrs. Talbot was looking for a companion, had gotten in touch, suggesting that Mavis might be very suitable, and she has remained with Mrs. T. ever since. Her OAA is rather small (only $90 or $94/mo.), but Mavis takes care of herself and is still very helpful around the house. $80 goes for room and board and Mavis keeps $10 for her own personal use.

These two act like a couple of sisters together. Mavis is a sweet, gentle woman who needs and works at keeping harmony within the home. Mrs. T. admits that she gets cross sometimes and when this happens, Mavis inevitably will ask if she is out of cigarettes, and if so, there is some haste to see that she is supplied with these adult pacifiers. Mrs. T. becomes so amused at this device that it probably serves its purpose very well.

Mavis has chronic HBP, according to Mrs. T., but otherwise she appears to be in good health. Their diet seems rather questionable as both are too stout and Mrs. T., who does all the cooking, will sometimes whip up a pie which goes for the entire meal and is apparently devoured at one sitting. Both women chuckle over this like a couple of kids. The apartment, one-half of a duplex, is very neat, cheerful, and allows for plenty of room for them both. Mrs. T. may be a little on the fatalistic side, but this seems like a reasonably serene, pleasant situation for our ex-pt.

***

ANDREW FARRAR

Born 1933. Admitted 1950 at age 16, out on prolonged visit to his parents a year later, and formally discharged in 1957. A 1950 Stanford Binet placed the IQ at 38, but this was considered too low an approximation. Almost blind, this boy had been at the Perkins School for three years but was apparently unable to learn Braille.

His mother's temporary hospitalization precipitated his stay at Pineland. At home, he helped at his father's small variety store and filling station. The interviewer's account follows subsequent events into more straitened circumstances:

The Farrar home was located in the middle of the State University forest. It was in somewhat shabby condition from the outside, and the yard had the look of an overgrown jungle. An old Chevy was somewhat buried in a driveway now filled with weeds and the like.

Both father and Andrew were sitting at the kitchen table waiting for me. The inside of the house was rather grubby but not too dirty considering it housed two men living alone. Andy was a red-faced young man with a rather sad, sullen expression. His clothing was in somewhat tattered condition as was his father's, with large holes here and there... and rather battered shoes. Mr. was a tall thin man with one leg. He hobbled around on crutches and had a kind of Scrooge manner. He did not appear to be really as hardhearted as he talked, and underneath it all, seemed quite fond of his son. At times during the questions he became very angry and asked if I did not know that Andy had the mind of a ten-year-old and would never change. Andy seemed to shudder every time this was mentioned.

The father said that Andy's health was good, but both men would break off into coughing spells lasting for about five minutes at a time.

Andy was alert and seemed more than willing to talk. The father interrupted several times and seemed to constantly play down anything that Andy said. When he said that he had had some friends next door, father said yes, but that was years ago and he really had had no friends. When Andy talked of his work, father said that it really was not that much... his son had never done a day's work. He then said proudly, though, that Andy walks six miles every morning delivering papers and could do it blindfolded. He seemed concerned that his son be dressed warmly for this and said that he recently had bought some insulated underwear for him.

Father said that Andy's mother had wanted him home as she had had a nervous breakdown and that he was glad he came home, too. Father did say that Andy was hard to live with as he was often frustrated because there were so many things he couldn't do and had a difficult time filling up the day. Mr. Farrar thought that the paper route had helped fill some of his time. Andy also washes the dishes and does chores around the house.

Mr. said that he and his wife had taught the boy to read with twelve-inch print books that Perkins School had told them to use. Said that he did not continue with his Braille as there was some problem about money to finance it. Perkins advised them that Andy should continue as he was. At one time Andy was getting Aid to the Blind, but after three or four months he had another check-up and one doctor felt he did not qualify. Mr. said that the state naturally "took this doctor's opinion rather than the one who felt he did qualify."

Mr. said that his wife had died of a spinal ailment about a year ago and that she had not been well prior to that as "she was always having nervous breakdowns." He said that she had been very upset when Andy was at the school and wanted him home... so when the school found that they could not help him they were more than happy to take him at home. About six months ago. Mr. said that he had hit his leg, and after that he had begun to ache severely. He went to several doctors before this was diagnosed as "baby cancer." Shortly after that his leg was amputated and he is now waiting for an artificial leg.

Andy's father proudly stated that Andy reads the newspaper every day and sometimes a few magazines. Mr. said that this was difficult for Andy, but that even though it took him a long time he thought he enjoyed it. About the only other thing Andy is able to do for recreation is go fishing every so often. Both felt that Andy's good eye had stayed the same since he had been at the school, but did say that he had not been for his check-up in "a long time."

One had the feeling that life in this home is far from ideal and that both men have the habit of reeling verbal atrocities at each other. Underneath all the bitterness and hate there seems to be some feeling of love, compassion or the like between the two. Mr. Farrar seems to constantly remind Andy of the reality of his limitations but does seem to be aware of the problems the boy faces. Andy appears to have some feeling of worth and usefulness because of his paper route, but one wonders what will become of him when his father dies.

***

JENNIE LYMAN

Born 1924. Admitted 1939 at age 14. First trial visit was in 1957, and discharge in 1959 at age 34. Several Binets placed her IQ in the 42 - 47 range, and a 1950 WB produced scores of Verbal 59, Performance 56, and Full Scale 54.

The economically and socially marginal parents had not really favored institutionalization, which had been urged by the local school and by neighbors. At Pineland Jennie was a willing worker with an agreeable personality, but very slow. The interviewer's account follows:

The Quimby residence is a fairly new white house (ranch type). It was tastefully furnished in upper-middle-class style.

I was greeted at the door by a petite, dark haired girl who announced she was Jennie. She silently led me to the living room, steering me to a chair with all the polite gestures. At this point, an aging, frizzle-haired woman appeared wearing a bathrobe. This was Madam Quimby, employer.

M.Q., a complainer, felt the days were passing her by, and was quite preoccupied with poor health and impending death. She expounded several strange ideas regarding medicine.

Jennie has been with Mrs. Quimby & hubby since discharge. She does domestic duties, under constant supervision.

At an early point in our conversation, M.Q. sent Jennie outside. She then explained that "she is frightfully stupid." Mrs. Quimby said, "she drives me crazy, sometimes." Then followed a series of examples. Mrs. Quimby stated, however, that she would not have the heart to send her away.

Jennie cannot count or manage money. With the direction of the Quimbys, she has a savings account of $384. She has bought a TV, her own clothes, and insurance. I saw nothing in Jennie's behavior which would demonstrate that this supervision was unnecessary. Jennie found my questions difficult to understand. She appeared to be thinking very hard with no result. She was extremely difficult to understand when she did speak.

Her life outside of work is quiet. She watches television, and visits Carrie Rogers. Every year she visits her family for two weeks in Sable Lake. Mrs. Quimby said that the family is hesitant to have her stay for long periods and now feels that two weeks is too long.

Mrs. Lyman, her mother, has frequently asked Jennie for money and has tried to withdraw money from her daughter's bank account. Mrs. Quimby instructed Jennie to keep her money and never give it to anyone. Jennie has little money sense, cannot make change, and would spend her money wildly without guidance.

She has fairly adult tastes -- TV, movies, etc., and seems out of the candy, bubble-gum stage. M.Q. felt Jennie incapable of living independently. Jennie herself seems fairly domesticated with a calm disposition and taciturn manner. She has little or no motivation, and is a contented cow with the Quimbys. While Mrs. Q. said that she frequently felt she would lose her sanity (because of Jennie's general incompetence), one felt that her bark was worse than her bite.

Jennie appears to be functioning as well as possible under supervision. She cannot read or write and values nothing save her television set. Her problems, while not severe, appear to result from mental handicap.

***

An appropriately sheltered milieu is provided for many female dischargees by live-in employment in private homes and nursing homes. Rather than the direct work supervision in the previous case, a more general personal guidance is the rule in the three cases that follow. With the first, Abigail Hayes, an almost ideal relationship seems to prevail. In the second case, that of Marjorie Carter, darker dynamics of a rather complex psychological captivity are suggested -- a condition from which this type of relationship is by no means exempt. Marion Maguire, in the third case, is of interest because of the apparently low IQ and quite high level of social performance -- the contrast here being with Jennie Lyman described above.

ABIGAIL HAYES

Born 1925. Admitted in 1937 at age 12. First trial visit in 1954, and discharge in 1960 at age 34, after 22 years of institutional supervision. A 1938 Revised Binet placed her IQ at 42, while a 1957 WAIS scored Verbal 64, Performance 67, Full Scale 63. As with many others in this group the retardation is classed as "familial".

When this girl was 10, her father was forced to go to a TB sanitorium, and because of apparent maternal inadequacies, the home was broken up. Health and Welfare moved in and placed the girl in a foster home where she "followed the foster mother around like a faithful dog" and for this offense was shipped off to PSS. At the institution, she was an excellent worker and had a good personality, but was shy and withdrawn in new social situations. The interviewer's account follows:

Abigail is a rather attractive woman in her late thirties. There is nothing about her appearance to suggest retardation, but in talking with one, she gives the impression of being very sweet and childlike. She is quite slim, and Mrs. Jensen mentioned that in 1963, Abigail had gotten run down because of having gone on a self-imposed diet. In view of the family history (fa. had TB), Mrs. J. became concerned, had her checked by the family doctor who got her back on a balanced diet. Her health has been excellent since then.

Mrs. J. said Abigail had been initially quite concerned at hearing from us, fearing that we had intentions of placing her in another job. She had been exploited at a TV placement prior to coming to the Jensens, there had been a lot of unpleasantness when Abigail was removed with the ex-employer threatening to "expose" Mrs. J. as running a house of ill-repute and planning to use Abigail for immoral purposes!

For the past year, the Jensens have been preparing Abigail for the changes which will take place when they retire. There has already been a prospective buyer looking over the place, and it will only be a matter of months probably before they sell. The Jensens do not live at the nursing home. They have a large house located about a block away and Abigail will be moving in with them. Mrs. J. anticipates some adjustment problems with Abigail at first since she is so used to living and working at the NH. She forms attachments very easily with co-workers and elderly patients with whom she is in daily, close contact. Some of the patients were there when Abigail first came to work, and all these people are "her family." To live in a large house (I mistook their home for the NH) with just Mr. & Mrs. J. will be very much different from what she has grown accustomed to, but the Jensens have wisely included Abigail in discussions of the changes their retirement will impose. They have eliminated much anxiety by assuring her that she will remain with them always and presented the situation in such a way that Abigail seems to be looking forward to living in the "nice, big house," as she calls it.

She calls Mr. & Mrs. Jensens her mother and father, which Mrs. J. says they have never felt it necessary to correct because Abigail is a dependent girl who needs this kind of identification. Her friends among the RNs and practical nurses are all the more maternal figures who tend to spoil her a little, Mrs. J. says, but nonetheless maintain satisfying relationships with her even after their employment has terminated. Mrs. J. has always explained to each new employee that Abigail is her Ward and is to be treated with kindness. Only once did she have a nurse who was disagreeable to Abigail at times when the Jensens were absent, but this information had not come from Abigail and had only been learned indirectly. (A. is no snitcher.)

Mrs. Jensen, in commenting on Abigail's maternal needs, also stated that she and Hub had two sons but no daughter, which conveyed the impression that this was a mutually satisfying relationship. She has discouraged any contact with Abigail's relatives (a sorry lot), and says A. has not mentioned any of them for several years. Mrs. J. heard that brother Michael was working in Sayre on a farm for a time, but Abigail had not known of this. She believes the mother may live in Newbury. Mrs. J. feels it is wise for Abigail to have a complete break with her family.

Abigail showed overt affection for Mrs. J., she trusts her, and looks up to her. When A. has a fondness for someone, she emulates the way they do things which, as Mrs. J. pointed out, would make a change of jobs very difficult since Abigail feels that their way is the only right way.

Abigail lacks flexibility. She becomes obstinate when her routine duties are varied, otherwise she performs well on the job. She carries trays, helps with the meals, does laundry and dishes, and cleans the rooms. Her own room on the third floor is well-stocked with stuffed animals and she has expressed a desire for a large doll which Mrs. J. has promised to buy her. Mrs. J. exercises caution in regard to allowing Abigail to go about by herself (neighborhood only) because she is so markedly immature and therefore suggestible, but Mrs. J. says her character is good, she never uses profanity or says anything out of the way. She visits several of the ex-employees quite frequently and goes for rides with them and with the Jensens. Abigail used to attend the one church in town - Congregational - but on one occasion a group of teenage girls sitting behind her had giggled all through the service, making her feel that they were poking fun at her, and she stopped attending. Abigail does not have the kind of temperamental or moody spells sometimes present in these protective situations which may well indicate that her needs are being met very adequately by the multiple mothering figures to whom she attaches herself. (I saw Mr. J. only in passing, but he seems to be an easy, jovial sort of person.)

***

MARJORIE CARTER

Born 1939. Admitted 1951 at age 11. First trial visit in 1959, and discharge in 1961 at age 21. A 1948 Stanford Binet placed her IQ at 70, while a 1958 WAIS produced scores of Verbal 59, Performance 67, Full Scale 60.

Illegitimate, this girl had a retarded mother (who later came to Pineland) and an irresponsible father. Under Health and Welfare custody by age 2, she was placed in a foster home which "broke up" when the girl was 11. H&W sent her to PSS. At the institution she was apparently ingrown, disturbed, depressed, had low frustration tolerance and psychosomatic ills, and did not perform up to capacity in school. These emotional problems seem to have contributed at least passively to her later adjustment. The remote location required an overnight stay for the interviewer who was also covering other cases in that area. The account follows:

Ronald's Rustic Inn and Motel is located on Main Street in Dark River. This is a rather attractive establishment and seems to draw a great many tourists passing through Adams County. As far as the motel is concerned, the Hooks have recently added five units to go with the four they had in the past. Still, this place is not so prosperous that one cannot see that the Hooks are pinching their pennies.

Both Mr. & Mrs. Hook work in the kitchen here from morning until night. They employ only two waitresses, two counter girls, and a kitchen helper (our ex-pt., Marjorie Carter).

Marjorie Carter is an extremely thin young girl of twenty-six. She is rather colorless with short brown hair. Were she not so drab looking she would be quite attractive. When I met with Marjorie and Mrs. Hook, Marjorie was extremely quiet - almost fearful. Mrs. Hook is a hard-looking but attractive woman in her forties. She and her husband have no children. Her husband is a large, rather obese man with a loud voice and rather crude manner. He appears to be rather hot tempered, often rude, but at times, quite charming.

Mrs. Hook seemed to be fond of Marjorie although she had a habit of both thinking and talking for her. At times she even seemed a bit hostile. Marjorie Carter has worked at this placement since discharge in 1960. She does kitchen work through the motel season for which she is paid $15/wk. In the winter she spends a month in Florida. Mrs. H. emphasized the fact that Marjorie is taken everywhere with them.

Marjorie sees other PHTC dischargees who work in the area. She has her own TV, and has learned to budget her money.

Though I was not entirely satisfied, I was left with the impression after my afternoon conversation with Marjorie and Mrs. Hook that this was a rather happy placement.

Round II

However, Marjorie appeared in the dining room shortly after I had finished my dinner and later at the door to my room. She then proceeded to tell me that she did not get along well with the Hooks and wondered if she left the placement would she be returned to PHTC? After some struggle in deciding whether to tell all, Marjorie said that she did not like the work here, especially the long hours. In particular though, she did not like the work from the moment of her discharge. She never made any trouble as she wanted to get her discharge. Things had not gone well from the beginning but now things were even worse. Mr. & Mrs. Hook were constantly bickering and often fighting over her. Generally Marjorie felt that the Hooks seem particularly upset. Mrs. Hook loses her temper often and both of them suddenly scold Marjorie to screaming heights when she makes even the smallest error. At times one will punish her for what the other has said. Marjorie said that this has put a lot of pressure on her and she has often lost her temper and done hateful things to Mrs. Hook. Marjorie said that she had asked Mrs. Hook to discuss these problems with me when I came. Mrs. Hook, however, didn't say a word. Marjorie said she would like to leave this placement and also would like to see Mrs. Hook in the morning and discuss the problems. If they were in the open some kind of improvement might come.

Round III

Saturday morning, Mr. Hook notified me at 7:30 AM that Mrs. Hook would like to see me. At 8:00 Mrs. Hook, Marjorie, and I gathered in a booth in the restaurant. Mrs. Hook stated that Marjorie had had a change of heart this morning. Mrs. Hook expounded on her great attachment to Marjorie and said she could not bear to part with her. They did everything for her, etc., etc. Yet it was Marjorie's decision. Mrs. Hook came forth with tears at this moment. I asked Marjorie about her decision and she made no response. Mrs. Hook then began to verbalize Marjorie's alleged feelings, leaving Marjorie no opportunity to speak. At about this point Marjorie began to cry and Mrs. Hook began to cry harder. Finally, Mrs. Hook who felt that everything was decided, blew her nose on a napkin and went back to work.

Marjorie then began to speak. She said she was confused but she thought she would like to give the Hooks one more try. Things might be better now that everything was out in the open.

On the slightly pleasanter side, Marjorie now corresponds with her mother who is working in Oslo, and has arranged to have her visit her sometime this month. (Mrs. Hook is somewhat hesitant about this.)

Marjorie is a nervous girl and seems to sport the scars of having been kicked around much of her life. She almost feels that she must endure all kinds of unpleasantries just to survive. She is very fearful of being returned to PHTC, and for this reason, I think, never complained about this placement. The Hooks enjoy her for her cheap services. I also think Mrs. Hook hangs onto her in compensation for a childless and possibly rocky marriage. In addition to being overworked, Marjorie also seems to be a kind of punch bag which both Hooks use to relieve their individual frustrations.

Marjorie is at quite a high level and is a capable worker. Her nerves, however, seem to be shattered - something which seems to be the result of her present placement. Often, she goes for days without eating properly. She admits she is depressed at times and these periods usually coincide with her loss of appetite. There are, I think, some complex things going on here. Marjorie will tolerate so much and then resort to physical violence (Hooks have also used physical violence on her). Yet she is almost masochistic in her unwillingness to remove herself from the situation. Some masochistic streak occurs during her starvation periods. She is withdrawn unless really pressed, also indicating a venting of emotions that is turned inward.

Marjorie's present placement is really not a good one. However, it seems that because of Marjorie herself, there will be problems in any placement. More info about Marjorie would be helpful in making an accurate judgement.

***

MARION MAGUIRE

Born 1929. Admitted 1938 at age 9. First trial visit in 1955, and discharge in 1958 at age 29. At Pineland she was aimiable and well behaved. A psychologist said that she "gave the impression" of higher IQ than her actual scores. The interviewer's account follows:

This is an interesting case, in that the girl has an IQ officially calibrated at: WB - Verbal 59, Performance 46, Full Scale 49 in 1953, along with an earlier reference to an IQ of 42.

Born in 1929, this girl is a junior member of the Maguire girls who were rounded up and Pownalized en masse, the older girls running a rural prostitution circuit with mother. This girl was placed in Pownal at the age of nine. Her sisters have also been released, along with a brother; the sisters have made marriages of varying degrees of success (or rather, failure). Marion at present remains single.

Occupationally, on trial visit, and following discharge, she has been employed as a domestic, doing housekeeping plus a certain amount of personal care now of an elderly woman at her present location.

She went out first on trial with a somewhat elderly Mr. & Mrs. Oakley, where she made a good adjustment, learned a great many things about housekeeping, cooking, personal grooming and the like, and has been taken under the wing of this family. She enjoys a kind of lineal relationship with them (she is employed now almost around the corner from this family), and Mrs. O. sees the relationship as a mother-daughter one, as does apparently Marion, who is quoted as saying that Mrs. O. is the only real mother she ever had.

The O.'s are elderly, respectable, middle-class, New Englanders of a past era, living in a ditto house that overlooks the river. Mrs. O. is a large, formidable woman with a soft and doting heart, Mr. O. is a quiet, thin, white-haired old man who moves about in the shadow of his wife.

I called at the Oakley home first, and Mrs. O. was quite defensive and irritated at first by the questions about Marion; she didn't see why Pineland should be at all concerned with Marion now, nor why any of the questions (eg. employment, etc.) had anything to do with the girl, as Marion was (too defensively?) seen as perfectly all right, nothing wrong with her brain at all, etc., successful in every way.

Up until two years ago, Marion was employed at the Oakleys. Then, her discharged sisters prevailed upon her to live with them. Marion regarded this move as final (some suggestion about finding a husband for her, too), and after she left, the O.'s obtained other help in the house. After a couple of weeks, however, Marion became disillusioned with her sisters and her prospects, also "homesick", and returned to Chatham. The O.'s could not employ her, but let her have a room in the house. Marion sought work at the local employment agency and obtained a housekeeping job almost around the corner at the Hermans. Up until the last few months, she had continued to stay at the Oakleys at night, but now stays full time at the Hermans, allegedly because of the health of the elderly lady there. Close contact by telephone and by personal trips, etc., continue between Marion and the Oakleys, however, and she reportedly goes to church with them every Sunday (Baptist). Her earnings at the Hermans are $25/week, to which is added her room and board, and probably uniforms, etc. She is completely responsible here as to housework, cooking and the like.

After the discussion with the O.'s, I then called on Marion herself, at the 37 Allen St. address.

Marion is an attractive woman with dark hair, blue eyes, a self-sufficient air, and nice manners, who ushers me into the kitchen for a discussion. She has a slight blurring of the speech, but moves about the house with precise movements, tending to kitchen chores, etc. One might judge that she was slightly "simple", but on the other hand, no simpler than many persons at large in society. She is definitely not at the Ethel Robbins level, and I have a slight feeling (does Mrs. Oakley have this, too?) that Marion might revert to the forest if she heard the appropriate call of the wild. (Yet, she did not respond at any length two years ago, and returned to the Oakleys.) Verbally, this girl is scarcely working at an abstract level, but from what she says (corroborated by Mrs. Goodwin), Marion seems to have some kind of social balance wheel, is aware that her sisters have made marriages just for the sake of marriage that have been inferior and burdensome, and prefers to stay single until a suitable offer from a suitable person is made to her. She is neither unattractive nor a misogamist (contrasted to say Ethel Robbins who can't get any comfortably closer to a man than to Billy Graham on television -- he is pure), and seems agreeable in a number of ways. (One feels that her blood is not low on estrogen.)

The alleged IQ and the subsequent performance of this girl seem at variance.

Working toward her support has been the personal interest of the Oakleys, along with their on-the-job social education, and continuing social support in many ways. (Marion gives one the impression of being able to be "easily influenced.") She has been grafted onto the Oakley family tree as a kind of honorary daughter or grand-daughter, and is thus as permanently related as she wishes to an ongoing, respectable middle-class household (there are Oakley children and grandchildren also in the geographic area, who relate to Marion). This is a lineal relationship to a socially successful unit with its own network. Mrs. O. (according to Marion) worries about her a lot (Marion is grateful for this), had called her up just that morning on the phone, and Marion in turn consults with Mrs. O. whenever she has any problems or questions (eg. about a new recipe, and how to go about it). How would Marion do without this type of support? Without it, would she be willing and able to relate herself to some other similar network?

I am puzzled as to whether this is some kind of successful symbiosis, with Marion going by some excessively simple rule of "stick-to-the-Oakleys," or whether there are qualities of the intellect, inverting the epitaph of "He never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one," which are tapped by the actual social situation rather than the test situation.

***

For many male dischargees, farm work provides a counterpart to the sheltering milieu that domestic work gives to females. Two examples are given here. Al Lovelace, in the first, is a totally institutionalized product. With Gregory Adams, in the second case, good social development has been maximized by an interested employer.

AL LOVELACE

Born 1912. Admitted in 1924 at age 12. First trial visit in 1956, and discharged in 1959 at age 46, after 34 years of institutional supervision. A 1924 Revised Binet gave IQ of 55, while scores on a 1958 WAIS were Verbal 62, Performance 80, Full Scale 68.

There was a background of early maternal desertion, an alcoholic father, and State Board of Charities and Corrections custody. On first admission, he was described as "nervous and sensitive," but long institutional erosion made him into a face in the crowd. The interviewer's account follows:

Al has been working on this medium-sized dairy farm since April of 1963, when his old employer found this job for him. This employer had sold his chicken farm in 1962, contacted welfare about Al, and the department had placed him at the Townsend Camp* where he remained until this opportunity arose to work for the Hayes. He has about fifty cows to help care for; there is clean-out work in the barn, haying, and some gardening. Al rated himself as only a fair worker, but I think this downgrading was only recognition of his limitations, since he seemed the sort of man to do a conscientious and thorough job.

Al is a short, stocky, middle-aged fellow who, except for a bad set of teeth, is quite presentable. He gives every appearance of being a very humble, docile, self-effacing man -- not the type personality to make much of an impact on people. He says he liked PSS, liked the Townsend Camp, and likes his present home. He very possibly could be moved about at will without any seeming objection from him. Except for his employer's interest in him, I doubt that he would have made any effort to leave the Townsend Camp. It is as if Al had no will of his own, no opinions pro or con, and one wonders if he would even make a splash if he fell in a pool, certainly not if it should cause any inconvenience to anyone.

As might be expected, he lives in a tightly constricted little world of early to bed, early to rise, with a little TV - not much else to round out his existence. He has only some very vague ideas of where his siblings are, and there are no close friends.

Al was alone at the farm when I first arrived, but in half an hour or so, the young Hayes children got home from school. Just as I was leaving, Mr. Hayes drove into the yard with the school bus.

Throughout the interview, Al had been quite preoccupied with some duties he had yet to perform. He seemed a bit nervous while we talked, but otherwise, very agreeable without indicating any curiousity as to the nature of the visit.

---

*Townsend Camp, under the direction of the State's Division of General Assistance, is a home for homeless and destitute men.

***

GREGORY ADAMS

Born 1918. Admitted in 1937 at age 18. First trial visit in 1955 after 18 years of institutionalization, and discharge in 1960 at age 42. Earlier IQ tests are missing. A 1954 WB gave scores of Verbal 53, Performance 55, Full Scale 49.

Mental instability ("insane spells") of the mother, old age of the father (a carpenter), and alleged antisocial acting out in the community combined with unusually strong political pressures to institutionalize the boy. At PSS he had a good disposition but was rather neglected and forgotten. New institutional policies and a good employer worked toward rehabilitation of this patient, whose earlier prospects would have been life-long custodiality. The interviewer's account follows:

The Mitchell farm is located atop a hill overlooking the west shore of the lake (Lake Tobias). It consists of five or six buildings in good condition and appears to be a prosperous dairy farm.

I was greeted by Mr. Mitchell, a long man, unshaven with sweat trickling from his brow. Cordial in a Yankee way, he led me into the house while informing me that Greg had gone down to the lake for a swim. Mr. Mitchell has several employees, but our ex-pt. is one of the few permanent employees.

"Greg" Adams has been with the Mitchells since his discharge from PHTC in 1960. He does general farm work, haying, and milking cows. Mr. M. stated that G.A. is able to perform these tasks independently, without close supervision. Mr. Mitchell further attested that he considers Gregory "an excellent worker."

Although he has no health problems, pictures show G.A. to be rather overweight. From Mr. Mitchell I gathered that Greg is well-known and well-liked. He is always cheerful and knows everyone in town, states Mitchell. After the work is done, Gregory goes into town every evening and chats with various people. In the summer he frequents the Cambridge Speedway, sees other ex-PHTC's, and has become famous for knowing the winners of every race for the last four years. Every Sunday he attends the local Congregational Church - not so much for the sermon but to see the people. He is also fond of church suppers and beano games and evidently is welcomed by the townsfolk at these events.

The Mitchells appear to have given much consideration to security for Gregory. With their assistance, he has taken out a small insurance policy which can be drawn after he is 65 to supplement his Social Security pension. G.A. gets $10/wk, room & board, and a Blue Cross - Blue Shield policy at this employ. He has $385 in a savings account and $1,000 held by a conservator.

Re money, G.A. has trouble distinguishing the different values and is apt to spend his money on "foolish things." Money has little value to him and he is apt to lose it in his travels around town. Because he is so well-known in town this handicap has given him no trouble.

Gregory seems fairly well grafted onto this family. The Mitchells have taken great pains to locate his relatives but had found them rather indifferent. He has had no contact with them since his discharge. The Mitchells plan to keep G.A. even after he is unable to work and seem generally fond of him. This rather low and domesticated ex-pt. seems to have integrated himself well in both the family and the community and seems to have achieved a good adjustment in all respects.

***

If intact and concerned, the home of origin can of course provide the sheltering milieu for a self supporting dischargee. Two illustrative cases with rather similar backgrounds are given here. The interesting variable is the economic one. For Johnny Carney in Maine earnings are marginal, as they had been for Roland Cyr. The move to more prosperous Massachusetts converted Roland into a major family breadwinner.

JOHNNY CARNEY

Born 1933. Admitted 1953 at age 19. Home on prolonged visit in 1958, and discharged in 1959 at age 25. CBS and brain trauma are suggested. A 1958 WAIS gave scores of Verbal 59, Performance 52, and Full Scale 54. Some test responses were rather bizarre, and a psychologist noted "severe personality maladjustment."

From a lower class family, this boy had had a series of arrests for Peeping Tom and related activities which culminated in a Men's Reformatory sentence, with transfer to Pineland. After discharge, there was an additional reformatory sentence in 1961 for a subsequent incident.

The Carney home is located in one of the more slummy sections of Morganton but aside from being in slightly run-down condition, is a rather typical lower-class dwelling. Mrs. Carney, a very slight woman in her early sixties, greeted me explaining that Johnny was at work but she would be glad to help.

Mrs. C. seemed to try to feel out whether I knew that Johnny had any trouble with the law and stated that Johnny had been at home with them since his discharge in 1959, had been a model son, etc. However, later in the game she did slip about a parole officer.

Johnny works presently at the Hotel Broadway (Morganton's attempt at a nightclub) as a maintenance man and part-time bartender. For this he is paid about $21 per week in two separate paychecks (most likely to eliminate the necessity of paying him minimum wage). He works from 10:00 in the morning until 4:00 in the afternoon. In addition he works Friday and Saturday nights until midnight tending bar. Mrs. C. felt that Johnny was not getting enough money but felt that they were powerless to do anything about it. This job was arranged, she said, through the parole officer about a year and a half ago. Before going to the Men's Reformatory he worked at a hotel in Majorport and at the Parker Hotel in Chester. Mother said that he was paid better at the Parker (comparable establishment to the Broadway) but still did not earn minimum wage.

Mrs. C. said that she and hubby look on the job as a means to fill up Johnny's time and keep him out of trouble. He has no close friends although he does at times bring other ex-PHTC pts. home with him. He occasionally dates a waitress at the Broadway, plays pool with his father, and belongs to the Eagles Club as does Mr. C. The greater part of the time he stays home and watches television (a late-show addict).

He does not pay room and board at home but does purchase his own clothes and other extra items. He is a heavy eater -- eats four or five times a day -- weighs 234 lbs. Mother describes him as generous and good-hearted -- displayed many presents that he had given the family. Mrs. C. stated that Johnny was afraid to apply for better paying jobs as they would inquire about the past and he fears he would be refused because of this.

It is difficult to tell how much this boy is capable of job-wise, but it looks as if he will never function with any full economic independence.

Mother seemed to have a rather pampering attitude towards Johnny. She would not discuss his trouble re Peeping Tom activities which seem to have remained a part of his behavior from pre-admittance days.

***

ROLAND CYR

Born 1940. Admitted in 1954 at age 14. Home on prolonged visit in 1956, and discharged in 1958 at age 18. CBS. A Stanford Binet yielded a score of 42, while a 1959 Goodenough and Porteus both scored higher at 57.

From a French Canadian family with a responsible mother and irresponsible father, this boy came to Pineland with rather too great maternal expectations of his "learning a trade" (skilled employment).

At home on prolonged visit, he worked for $3 per day on a garbage truck. After discharge, home conditions were impoverished, he was observed scavenging meals off the town dump, and a series of petty thefts won him a reformatory sentence with transfer to Pineland, where his stay was brief. The interviewer's account takes up the story in Massachusetts:

Wallace, Massachusetts is an elderly mill town northwest of Boston with a population in 1960 of some 70,000. In 1950, the population was 80,000. It still has a fairly energetic air, but there is little sign of new industrial development and the overall tone is one of controlled decline.

A principle street, Washington, runs north and south through the town -- this is also Route 36 -- and Aldrich Street is a short street of a block or so that runs into Washington -- quite centrally located in the town.

The housing on Aldrich Street is typical of the multiple-family frame-housing found in the less affluent districts of the greater Boston area -- Cambridge, Somerville, etc. -- frame tenements or frame houses intended for or made over into apartments - dingy but not dilapidated (would win a benign smile from the City Manager of Portland).

No. 12 Aldrich St. at first seemed to be missing, but turned out to be a single-family frame house (7 rooms) set back from the street in a sort of asphalt courtyard. Several children were playing here, riding bicycles, carrying on animated conversation in French (Canadian, I think). Two little girls easily shifted lingual gears to assure me of Mrs. Cyr's whereabouts, leading me into the house.

The dwelling itself was in sound but rather worn condition, sparsely furnished but generously peopled. Mrs. Cyr and eight of her children live here, the youngest being Anita, a teenager of fourteen or so, pretty and rather Egyptian in appearance. However, fourteen was not the cut-off point of those present -- I had a general impression, except for Mrs. Cyr, of vast milling numbers of individuals from about age 25 on down to a small baby being held and bottled by a quite young mother. (Possibly there were several small babies about.) This was a Sunday afternoon.

I was taken into the kitchen and there introduced to Mrs. Cyr and also to Roland, who was seated at the kitchen table as a fully integrated member of an animated cluster of young adults. A sister or sister-in-law said something to him in a friendly, teasing fashion as I entered.

To go through the questionnaire, we returned to the living room, Mrs. Cyr and Roland sitting opposite me. A large portion of the rest of the household also trooped in to crowd together on the sofa or take available chairs, where they sat with eager anticipation as if expecting me to remove from my briefcase many white rabbits and colored silk handkerchiefs. This was, when I saw it, a very happy household where members enjoyed one another's company and where there seemed to be much mutual affection among all members.

Mrs. Cyr is the apparent "head of the household" here, her husband being in Rangifer, Maine. The reasons for this separation were unstated, and I did not probe. Mrs. Cyr is a woman of 43, spare, dark, of a "sweet" nature, intelligent, practical, and somehow giving the impression of a woman of 50 who looks younger than her years. I would feel that given a better husband and better economic opportunities than in the past, and fewer children, she would have fitted easily into an LM suburb.

Roland spoke but little, nodding assent or denial to various questions if they were directed to him. His mother was the principle spokesman. (He has a considerable speech defect and is perhaps reluctant to speak.) He gives somewhat the impression of retardation, along with some of the reticence and shyness of the retarded, looks perhaps older than his years (born 1940) and of a somewhat less favorable appearance than his siblings.

The family left Rangifer in 1961, coming to Wallace at the suggestion and urging of a married son who had migrated earlier there. One way, it was a journey of some eleven hours by car and U-Haul Trailer. Mr. Cyr, the father, although coming with this migration has for some reason subsequently moved back to Rangifer. The children of this marriage are either "grown up and married" (3), or are living with Mrs. Cyr, who has been described in case histories as the responsible one of this couple. (The father is cited for petty theft and alcoholism.)

Roland's A.D. payments had continued through this period and up until he obtained work in some kind of textile mill as a Carpet Folder some two years ago. This was a night-shift job, with overtime running it into 12 hrs. at a stretch at times. Mrs. Cyr said that on some weeks of overtime, Roland was bringing home as much as $100.00 or $105.00 per week! On a few weeks, very sporadic, when income dropped below a certain level, he had received Unemployment Security payments as compensation. His mother had obtained a $700.00 car and Roland had covered all the payments on this himself from his own wages. He also contributes to the purchase of groceries and other items in a most generous way, and presently pays a portion of his income per week to his mother. As he has no savings at present (or, it is said to be none -- Q. of A.D.C.?), it seems that in the last two years Roland has been functioning pretty much as a senior breadwinner for this family group. (Mrs. Cyr also works.)

His mother reports that he was very pleased to have gotten employment in Wallace, and that this has been a real satisfaction to him. Previous employment in Maine has always been sporadic, irregular, and low-payed.

The Carpet Folder job continued for about two years and was voluntarily ended about a week ago. For the past week, Roland has worked at a new job -- that of Racker for Massachusetts Aluminum Co. (Mfg of storm doors, windows, etc.). This job was obtained through his brother who also works there. After a trial of a day or so, they said they would keep Roland on. This change of work was at instigation of Mrs. Cyr, who felt that Roland's health was being or could be affected by the long hours of the night-shift work and by his having some difficulty in getting his sleep in the daytime (when this household might be a rather boisterous one).

Although she and Roland (and probably others) are working, Mrs. Cyr still receives a small sum of A.D.C. money ($59.00 every other week) for the support of her minor children.

Contrary to the belief that although wages may be higher in Massachusetts, expenses are higher there, too, Mrs. Cyr believes that Massachusetts expenses are not higher, but are about the same, as there are always sales and specials of various sorts at the many stores in Wallace. The rental on this 7-room house is only $15.00 per week. On the other hand, wages are definitely higher here and employment much more available. Although not wallowing in wealth, this family is seemingly much better off than in their case history reported 1959 condition in Rangifer when all younger siblings were described as thin and undernourished, and Roland had been found on several occasions scavenging his meals off the Rangifer town dump. Economic factors must be considered as highly important here for the general functioning of the whole family and for the retardate's feelings of importance, worth, and usefulness to his family.

Socially, Roland seems rather closely bound to his job and to his family. Occasionally he goes bowling, or to stores, and weekly to the movies, but according to his mother, someone almost always accompanies him on these outings (this has a kind of compulsory tone in the telling), perhaps as a precaution against any recurrence of his alleged petty thefts in Rangifer prior to his second, brief entry into PHTC... He has recently bought a bicycle, gloriously equipped, and has made trips in Wallace with this.

His mother says that Roland is devoted to her (this aside, as I was on the porch, leaving) -- and she in turn seems very attached to him. When they had first placed him in PHTC in 1954 or so, "to learn a trade," he had seemed so homesick and upset that she was no longer willing to have him away from home.

Mrs. Cyr seems to feel that his principle trouble is speech and communication (this may be so). She would like it if he could in some way "learn a trade" still, since at some time in the future she herself will "go away" (die), and she would like to feel that Roland "will be taken care of" (be able to be clearly economically self-supporting). But she added quickly that there would be the various brothers and sisters who would take care of him if she herself were not there. (I made suggestion of looking into education through Vocational Rehabilitation.)

This was a pleasant visit. Roland, although somewhat ill at ease at first, seemed to become reassured that the visit would do him no harm. Because of the rather large numbers of family present and listening, it seemed not possible to go easily into some of the more personal or sensitive aspects of this case, such as the reasons leading up to his arrest in ca. 1959, the role of the father, and reasons for the father's absence.

***

Further along this range of rather close social direction and sheltering, there are some dischargees who although short of full independence, function in the community at the end of longer extension cords than do others. Two examples are given. James Howe, in the first, seems more on an egalitarian level at home and in his work than do cases previously described. Foster Conley, in the second example, although temporarily disabled, also seems more independent, and his relationship with his mentors appears more voluntary than compulsive.

JAMES HOWE

> Born 1929. Admitted 1945 at age 16. Home on prolonged visit to parents in 1947, but not discharged until 1958 when he was 29. Deafness and nervousness contributed to a low score of 47 on a 1945 Stanford Binet. On a 1957 WAIS his scores were Verbal 62, Performance 85, and Full Scale 70.
>
> Some alleged small-town contretemps in which ladies' undergarments disappeared from neighbors' clotheslines, and a long-distance gunshot at a passerby, led to this boy's committal to PSS. His close and united family exerted legal and other pressures to get James home again on the PV basis. After the death of his parents, an interested sister assumed responsibility. The interviewer's account follows:

James and his sister were both busy elsewhere when I called at the home, but Mr. Lunt was chopping up some wood in the yard, said he would have time to talk with me, and, although reticent by nature, I think, he was very cooperative.

Mr. Lunt seemed a bit concerned with giving a "good report," but I doubt that this was too difficult since James appears to be an industrious worker who has many opportunities to work for neighbors and cottagers around Baikal Lake. A Mrs. Lovelace for whom James has worked over many years writes us that the ex-pt. has been her "main stay" since her husband's death five years ago. She says he is "very versatile, can figure out almost any problem, both at her farm and cottage." Of his stay at PSS, Mrs. Lovelace writes, "Pownal was entirely his salvation -- it changed him from an idle, undisciplined boy to a useful citizen."

Mr. Lunt, who himself works for the town, has been instrumental in getting James road work during the winter months. This, combined with his many job opportunities with summer residents, gives James a fairly steady income over the year. He does such varied jobs as gardening, painting, sanding roads, cutting brush, mowing lawns, and cleaning hen houses. James derives most of his satisfaction from working, likes to keep active. He does well within the secure, semi-protective environment provided by the Lunts. He seems also fortunate to be located in a small, rural community which accepts him and offers many opportunities for his kind of services.

Mr. Lunt indicated that the family has had financial difficulties. He has his own tractor and picks up what jobs he can for the town besides being a maintenance man at the State House, but James may have helped them some in addition to the $20 per week for his board & room. Last year the Lunts' young son had an eye put out in a rock-throwing incident, and the Town Clerk allowed James to claim the boy as a dependent so he could get refund money to help out.

***

FOSTER CONLEY

Born 1906. Admitted 1919 at age 13. First trial visit in 1956, after 36 years of institutionalization. Discharge in 1959 at age 52. In 1920 a Revised Binet gave an IQ of 64. A 1952 WB produced scores of Verbal 72, Performance 75, Full Scale 64 (?).

Neither in state custody nor a town pauper, Foster was urged into PSS by a local school superintendent. The slightly marginal parents had toward him a slightly ambivalent attitude. At the institution, his nature was friendly but his work slow. This is another example of human material salvaged from lifetime custodiality. The interviewer's account follows:

Foster has been living in the immediate vicinity of his friends, the Peters, since he came to Woodbury about four years ago. (He left his job at Goshen Academy a year after his discharge.) He went job hunting on his own, tried at Cardiff General Hospital and a cotton mill before applying at State University at Woodbury where after a trial, he was hired permanently. He said the boss liked his attitude which was that he would be willing to try any job and give the best he had.

Foster purchased a second-hand trailer which was set up directly across the road from the Peters. A year ago he had a chance to sell at a slight profit and since the trailer was in need of repairs (also too expensive for Foster to maintain), Foster had jumped at this opportunity to unload it. He now rents a small, makeshift camp at the rear of the Peters house for the nominal rent of $3 per month. Foster gets his own meals which are sweetened up often by Mrs. Peters' offerings of home-cooked items. Foster had chosen to talk with me in the Peters kitchen so I did not see the interior of the camp.

Aside from their value as friends, Mr. & Mrs. Peters, both in their late middle years and kindly appearing, give Foster a feeling of security and sensible guidance while still allowing him maximum latitude in managing his own affairs, or so it appeared. Foster maintained how nice they have been to him, and Mr. Peters added that none of Foster's relatives in this area (there is an uncle and a number of cousins) have shown the slightest interest in him, wouldn't even put him up for the night, as a matter of fact, so that was why Foster was here. The ex-patient said all this was the absolute truth.

Mr. Peters said he used to be employed at the State University (retired, I guess). The Peters place is a small farm, but I don't know if it is still a productive one. The family seemed to be between high-lower and low-middle class judging from appearance.

Foster seems to have been a good worker at the University where he assumes sundry duties of the maintenance type. He described how when the trays of dirty dishes come to the kitchen by dumb waiter, he cleans out all the refuse, readying dishes for the automatic dishwasher. He scours pots and pans, washes floors, empties rubbish, and fills in as a utility man when other employees are on vacation or out sick.

Last May while he was carrying out some rubbish pails, he struck his foot against one of the steel tables in the dining room. It had seemed to be a minor mishap, but that night his foot had swelled and infection followed. These complications seemed to develop because of his diabetis. He subsequently spent five weeks in the hospital that terminated only because of Foster's dissatisfaction with the medical treatment. He said large blisters formed where they had kept his foot wrapped up for so long. He had told them he was going home and would treat himself. His physician, a Dr. Cole, sees him about once a month but as yet, Foster does not know when he can return to work. Meanwhile, he receives about as much money ($37/wk.) as he regularly carries home, through Workmen's Compensation, but he is restless and would like to get back on the job. The only fortunate thing about this injury was Foster's refusal to have his foot amputated. This had been the recommendation of his doctor at the time of his hospitalization.

Foster says he doesn't form friendships with others and that he is very careful about the company he keeps. It sounded as if he had been cautioned about this by the Peters. There was also an incident while he was working at Goshen which rather shook him up. Some fellow had tried to talk Foster into going to town with him but there was something about this man which made Foster suspicious so he had declined. A short time later, Foster had read in the paper that this man had shot his wife in the back of the neck. Now Foster seems to feel that the best way to avoid trouble is to mind your own business and not become involved with others. Except for the Peters family and their relatives, his relationships with people are pleasant but superficial. He has a great affection for the Peters grandchildren and likes to give them small amounts of money and inexpensive presents.

He doesn't like to associate with other dischargees because of their reminiscences of PSS. Thirty-nine years of his life were spent here and he wants to forget the whole thing. He wonders why he was kept here so long, but he also takes pride in being able to adjust to outside living after so long a time of institutionalization. Before leaving here, he had been cautioned about the difficulties involved. What worries him now is what will take care of him in his old age since he was at PSS during most of his wage earning years. He asked me about this and we discussed SS and OAA (which he had not heard of).

Foster speaks slowly and likes to explain everything in the most minute detail, but he is friendly and relates easily. He got the giggles occasionally, but this seemed to be a nervous mannerism since he takes a very serious, feet-on-the-ground attitude towards life.

***

Marriage has not been discussed in previous sections. For dischargees, as for the general public, marriage can be a mixed package. For female dischargees, it covers a broad spectrum that ranges from extreme psychological, social, and economic sheltering to mature mutual sharing and cooperative endeavor. For males, the sheltering end of the continuum is necessarily more limited. At any level, the rewards and/or miseries can be numerous.

The ten illustrations given in this section do not fall into standard lower or middle class patterns for marriage, but do serve to illustrate certain forms of social adjustment seen in this population. More "typical" examples are given in a later section.

Atypicality has several causes. The age, social and work skills, and general background of the dischargee are contributory here. Dischargees from a school for the retarded do not come to the marriage market at always the best time and with the most bargaining power. Often they must take what they can get. And their values and needs, apart from universal needs, can in some cases be rather different from those of "normal" persons. This is not to say that these described marriages are unsatisfactory. Most of the cited cases are rewarding to the partners, some markedly so.

In these ten cases, several types of deviation from a norm occur. In two cases, the dischargees' husbands are partial free-loaders; three cited cases are more or less commonlaw; one case is socially marginal in the city, one is so in the country; one represents excessive sheltering; and two depict the aftermaths of unsuccessful marriages. (This brief categorization is of course a considerable oversimplification of the complex dynamics illustrated in this section.)

In general, these cases can perhaps best be regarded as representing a group that is intermediate or in a variety of ways transitional. They lie between, and in some instances are coincident with, the sheltering milieu on the one hand and a more "normal" ideal on the other.

The first two cases illustrate movement between a sheltering milieu and more demanding marriage. In the first, Beatrice Dow, typical of the protected females previously described, has left this earlier state for a rather precarious marriage with a partner of doubtful reliability. In the second instance, Marion Johnson has moved out of a somewhat similar and unsatisfactory marriage and into a more restricted way of life. The limited social and mental capacities of such female dischargees can be far overtaxed by the character of the particular spouses.

BEATRICE DOW

Born 1927. Admitted 1937 at age 9. First trial visit in 1957, and discharge in 1960 at age 32. A Revised Binet in 1937 placed her IQ at 64. A 1960 WAIS produced scores of Verbal 59, Performance 77, and Full

Scale 65. Ascribed etiology is familial.

The family of origin was both marginal and indifferent, and Beatrice was in 6 different boarding homes between 1934 and 1937, when the City of Majorport moved her to PSS.

A minority of post-discharge marriages were endogamous, and Beatrice's is one of them, as her husband, Archibald Johnson, is also a dischargee. The interviewer's account follows:

> The Johnsons live on a short, generally pleasant street in the residential area of Riverton. Neighboring houses are in a much better state of repair and in the low middle class category. This place was probably a private dwelling, later converted to an apartment house. (The landlord is said to own quite a number of these low-rent houses.) This house, which has undoubtedly seen much better days, was very cold and drafty. The couple had closed off the kitchen to get what heat they could from the kitchen stove. Beatrice complained about needed repairs, particularly in the bathroom which was a mess, she said. Although they pay only $10/week for this four-room apartment, they hope to find another couple to live in and share expenses. (With rent deducted, Archibald clears only $20-$25/week.)
>
> Although Beatrice is thirty-eight, she gives the impression of being a sweet, innocent little girl. The recognition of her limitations gets very light treatment from her as, for instance, she exclaims enthusiastically that she was "awful dumb in school." She had been told by some social worker that there was a fund available to her in Morganton (Mother's Survivor benefits?) -- money which the couple sorely need, but Beatrice explains her lack of investigation matter-of-factly as, "I can't write with the trouble I have." On the other hand, it delighted her that we progressed with so little trouble on the questionnaire as sister-in-law, Eleanor, had predicted failure due to her inability to read or write. Her lack of rancor in this, as in so many matters, and her childlike helplessness would make most anyone wish she could be handed a bunch of these little triumphants to nurture as one would a bouquet of flowers.
>
> Until Beatrice married Archibald, her post-discharge life was very narrow and sheltered, consisting of live-in housekeeping positions where she was watched over maternally and not allowed much opportunity for social outlets. This would seem to be a half-blessing which Beatrice best explained by her ambivalence over her present situation. She recognized her right to a "life of her own," as she said, but again there was the security of being looked out for by her several employers -- mature, mostly kind women who made decisions for her. To her credit, Beatrice wanted more than this, but she is just now experiencing the hardships and uncertainities that go with more freedom. Beatrice realized the need for her to supplement the family income, but she doesn't have the know-how or initiative to explore work possibilities. She has made a point of visiting the neighbors (women on a par with past employers) because she says she likes to know the people she is living near, but also I would think that she looked upon them as prospective employers or people who would help her. One lady has promised to help her find work through some community group, but on the whole she seemed a bit disappointed with her reception in the neighborhood. She showed a lot of reluctance or timidity about accepting work very far from her apartment. The three jobs she has had were all obtained through PHTC, a past employer, and her sister-in-law.
>
> Until her marriage, Beatrice had worked continuously. Her job with Mrs. Harvey (TV placement) lasted until about a year ago when Mrs. Harvey's sister-in-law, an elderly widow living in Centerbrook, asked for her. Beatrice

had a lot of affection for this woman, liked her job very much, but her employer died several months ago. (Beatrice believes this lady has left her a small sum of money - perhaps $1,000.) Beatrice then moved to Taftsville where Eleanor got her another housekeeping job. It was then that she began going out with Archibald whom she had known at PSS. Within a month's time they were married, and Archibald moved into her employer's house. This was an impossible situation which was quickly terminated by her employer within a matter of a few days. Since then Beatrice has been unemployed.

Archie, in spite of being an affable, friendly fellow, seems to be an opportunist and free-loader. He had boasted to his employer that Beatrice came with a dowry of $5,000 (more like $1,000). At any rate her savings quickly vanished when Archie bought a secondhand Pontiac for $500 and paid off the purchase price on an old "fishing trailer" with the balance. It would take someone less crafty than a confidence man to "take" Beatrice, for Archie lacks the capability to be a rogue in the usual sense of the term. Charming he may be, but subtle he is not. Even so, Beatrice isn't entirely deceived. She is thankful that Archie lost his license a couple of months ago for he then got rid of the car. He had traded it for two hunting rifles, admittedly a sad bargain, says Beatrice, but it probably averted further trouble. The trailer has "gone down the drain, too," adds Beatrice good-naturedly. She said they only lived in it one or two months for when the rains came it leaked so badly that Beatrice had insisted they move out. The present apt. house is owned by Archie's employer, the rent being deducted from his pay automatically.

I don't think Archie's excesses create much anger or despair in Beatrice, partly because by nature she seems good-natured, passive, and with little or no conception or regard for the value of money. Supposedly she was saving her own money these several years, yet she had no idea of how much money she had accumulated. I quizzed her a little about her wages since they had remained at the TV rate of $10 per week. I found that when employers brought up the amount of wages to be paid, Beatrice would tell them she was paid $10 a week and they could pay her this or less, as they wished. She seems equally unconscious of the passage of time even when it involved such a recent event as their moving into their present apartment. With a little thought, she could give her age, but she did not know what year she was born. She claimed to be able to tell the difference between the denominations of paper money but not silver. It is perhaps just as well that Beatrice can philosophically accept her limitations as part of "her trouble" as she calls it, because she may be spared a lot of humiliation and anxiety.

***

MARION JOHNSON

Born 1920. Admitted in 1938 at age 17. On prolonged visit with parents in 1954, and discharged in 1957 at age 36. A 1938 Revised Binet gave an IQ of 64, while a 1953 WB produced a Full Scale of 80. Epilepsy rather than retardation appears to be the major negative factor.

From a reliable lower class family, this girl progressed satisfactorily through grammar school. Following several arson attempts (un usual among our female patients) she was sent in 1937 to Cardiff State Hospital (a mental hospital), with transfer to PSS. Her family worked continually for her release. On prolonged visit, she was employed as a waitress, and helped to provide for her elderly parents. Her later marriage to a man named Haskell was reported to have been a good one; the interviewer's account, however, tells a different story:

> I found Marion at the home of her employer on East Street. This is near the center of town in a rather nice section of summer estates. Marion's employer seemed to rent rooms upstairs (probably in-season only). Marion's employer did not show herself, but was present in the kitchen.
>
> I was greeted by a timid, brown-haired lady who looked to be dying slowly of fright. She led me to the living room where there was a small menagerie and two children about 7 and 4. The place was nicely furnished, middle-class style. Marion looked somewhat mousey, clothing of '50 - '40 vintage, and old lady shoes with thick heels. She sat rigidly, was soft spoken, and seemed to await some kind of impending doom. She was frail, looked sickly (kind of a frail, unworldly consumption victim, hopelessly naive of worldly ways), a la 19th century novels. She seemed, however, quite determined and had a way of sticking out her chin to make a point. She seemed to be shriveled by a pain too great to bear. The fear seemed to enclose her personality so much that she seemed lifeless.
>
> I discovered to my surprise that Mr. Haskell, reputed to be a stable, hard-working chap, had been lazy and irresponsible. The two parted last December when Mr. Haskell had been sans job for over a year. Mr. H. did not enjoy working, was unfaithful after the nagging began, rather allergic to employment agencies and often, co-workers. During the seven years of this marriage, which Marion stated was a nightmare, Marion was supported by the city of Farnsworth and what little employment she could find. Hubby had little or no education and was also an epileptic.
>
> Marion is fragile physically, is epileptic, prone to spells due to bad nerves, had a lung collapse in '58, and suffers from high blood pressure and circulatory problems. She doctors every six weeks. Because of this she has worked very little. Her only experience has been in domestic work. She said she enjoys this best as she is able to take care of children. This is her great love -- children. (She is sterilized.)
>
> Marion lives alone, further down on East Street, in a rooming house. She sees no one, returns home from work and watches television or reads "Modern Romances." She seems devoted to her family and has given up movies, etc., because her father is ailing and she does not feel it is right to enjoy while he is suffering. Every week-end she helps her mother care for him in Sunrise Harbor.
>
> She stated that she has no friends now but had one once...shortly after her break-up with hubby; she lived in Crockett's Trailer Court with another lady. This woman borrowed $400 from the bank, got Marion to sign the note, then skipped town. This Marion pays back at the rate of $20 each month.
>
> Marion has little interest in friendship or remarriage. Her only interest seems to be reading and watching soap-opera conceptions of the world, her family, and children. Other interests: 7th Day Adventists and her Bible.
>
> She was cold -- her "real self" seemed to be buried in mountains of fear. She showed no expression until it was time for me to leave. My impression was that she did not completely understand why I had come. When it came to asking me, it was a matter of, "Do I dare? Do I dare?" And she did nothing but flutter as a young bird afraid to fly, lost in contemplation of the fear. Only as I stood on the doorstep, did she open up enough to exchange pleasantries.

***

Differences in the two variables, the capacity of the dischargee and the character of the spouse, can produce quite different results. In the first of the two cases next presented, Linda Maloy after a period marked by rather intense emotional problems, has moved to a highly sheltered milieu with a sympathetic and almost pathologically protective spouse. In the second case, Janie Maguire, after a knock-down, drag-out marriage to an alcoholic, has moved on to relative independence and economic self-sufficiency. The childhood background of the first dischargee is a relatively much more disturbed one. Both are intellectually about equal.

LINDA MALOY

Born 1935. Admitted 1949 at age 14. Out on trial visit in 1957, and discharged in 1959 at age 24. A 1949 Stanford Binet placed her IQ at 62. Scores on a 1957 WB were Verbal 79, Performance 65, Full Scale 69. A "familial" case.

The parents were apparently quite marginal and unstable, and this girl was in Health and Welfare custody at age 5. She came to her third foster home at age 7 with "scars on her wrists from being tied to chairs and scars on the buttocks from being placed on a hot stove as punishment for soiling herself" -- this treatment having been received from the prior placement. After a fourth foster home, she was sent to Pineland, where she proved to be both pleasant and well behaved. The interviewer's account follows:

Linda was located through her sister Justine's sister-in-law, Mrs. Mavis Dearborn, who reported via the telephone that our ex-pt. was married now to an older man who, although in poor health, was taking good care of Linda. I was directed to an apartment house on River Street in So. Majorport, where the couple have resided since their marriage about a year and a half ago.

There is a forlorn sign announcing "Castle Apartments" above the front door; however, according to Linda and her husband, it is known by far more descriptive labels by the local populace. This couple were amazed that I did not know the place by its unsavory reputation. For all its build-up, it appears to be quite an ordinary LB establishment located just over the Majorport - South Majorport bridge. Linda acted quite disturbed at living here since there are many unmarried couples with apartments at this address and anyone living here is automatically classed as a prostitute. Our ex-pt. claims that friends decline to visit her and make derogatory remarks about her for living in such a place. (Sister, Justine, lived here also for a time, however, and Linda's husband has lived here the past six years.)

Linda is a slight, rather pale brunette of ordinary appearance who is now in her early thirties. Although my visit was unplanned, Linda readily invited me inside and though somewhat restrained, showed no outward concern. She had heard via Irma Folsom that a "Welfare Worker" would be calling on her, and, although she tries to keep her PSS background a secret from most people, she had told her husband everything about herself which eliminated any awkwardness or anxiety.

The apartment is small -- only two rooms -- but neatly kept and furnished reasonably well. It looks out on the highway and in the summer particularly they are kept awake much of the night because of the traffic going over the bridge. Husband, Roger, hopes for a time, after they pay off a hospital bill, when they can buy a cabin in the woods somewhere and find fresh air, quiet, fishing, etc. The couple live entirely on the disability pensions (VA and SS) which Roger has collected for about eight years, although occasionally Linda babysits. She is very nervous, finds working for others difficult, so her husband has not encouraged her to find a job. The two pensions, which together amount to about $190 a month, are enough to keep them going modestly, and they also receive surplus food.

Roger has not worked in about eight years - or since he was fifty. He has a history of T.B. and presently is being doctored for a gastric ulcer. He is a small, frail man with a heavily lined face - soft-spoken, kindly appearing, and perhaps pre-occupied with the hard lot that is his. His employment history is rather vague but he had been employed as a fire fighter back along, mentioned being bothered by seasickness and apparently pursued this occupation on the water. There were other jobs of a seasonal sort, I think, but no details. He was a bachelor with few family ties, apparently, until he met Linda and married her last year. Roger said many people wondered why he had gotten married at this time of life, but, as Roger explained it, he had dated women but never before was interested enough to marry one.

Although there is a vast difference in their ages, this couple have a common bond, it appears, because of their respective handicaps and a general view of other people as exploitative, uncaring, and unkind. With Roger, who spoke of numerous acts of kindness to others, there is the bitter feeling that people take advantage and in the end one must look out for oneself. Had he known he was going to marry, Roger said, he would have saved the money he spent on others so that they could move away, maybe have a car, and a few creature comforts.

Linda also feels this exploitation and callousness which for her is epitomized in the way she was treated by the putative father of her son, Jimmie, born two years ago. Almost to the moment the child was born, she had begged the father to marry her just to give the baby a name, but he had said she was just another girl he had gotten pregnant and why should he marry her. In her decision to place the baby for adoption was also the feeling that this child should not be boarded out from one place to another perhaps to be cruelly treated as she had been as a child.

Linda speaks as if she were profoundly shaken by this event. Her own contribution to the results is half-accepted but couched somewhat in ignorance or innocence of the ways of the world. She stated with conviction that only one man could have been the father but, as usual in such cases, the family of the man involved had cast doubt about this. Following the birth and almost immediate adoption of this child, Linda decided to leave So. Majorport because of the shame she felt. A sister in Tilbury Town found her a job taking care of an elderly lady and Linda remained there for about six months or until this woman died.

She then returned to So. Majorport and sister, Justine, who at that time was living at the Castle Apts. It is apparently then that Linda became acquainted with Roger. Linda had some complications following the birth of her child and has had some ovarian and kidney trouble. She doesn't believe that she can have any more children unless or until this condition clears up. I don't think either of them really want children. Linda has never held jobs requiring the care of young children because they make her nervous and Roger mentioned the inadvisability of having children at her age. As for her son, she knows the family in Branford who adopted him, but she has not seen the child since she left the hospital and feels it is best not to think about him or ever visit him. If people ask, she tells them the child died.

Linda has held either live-in, domestic jobs or else she has lived with relatives and worked out throughout the discharge period. What problems she has seem more emotional than mental and she appears quite dependent on others for security. Linda harked back to PSS days when apparently she had some kind of nervous breakdown, and although there was been no repeat of this, a doctor had told her it could happen again, she said.

Her longest period of employment was the eighteen months spent as a candler and fish packer in Majorport. Most other jobs (domestic, nurses' aide, dishwasher) have been of six months or less duration. Linda calls herself only a fair worker because she is quick-tempered and unable to tolerate supervision. If employers would just let her do her job her own way, things would be alright, she said. (Nerves seem to be the major drawback.) She may have been fired from a couple of places or gone off in a huff - both were mentioned in passing along with one episode of a jealous wife. As a homemaker Linda appears entirely capable and she is able to prepare all meals. She and hub share household duties, the grocery shopping, etc.

Socially she calls herself a loner or words to that effect. There are several women in the same apt. bldg. who visit with her but these are casual relationships of only geographical significance and she has made no permanent friends. Among relatives she is closest to sister Justine, with whom she has lived several times since her discharge, but there is continual contact with other sibs in the area. Linda lived a couple of years with her father until his death of a heart attack about four years ago. There was no mention of her mother who would be very elderly if she is still alive.

If Mrs. Dearborn's attitude is any barometer, it would seem that the relatives are pleased that Linda married Mr. Barrett, if only because she has a relatively secure niche for herself. He seems concerned that Linda be happy, and made the observation, during a brief absence of his wife, that he thought she would never have been happy with a husband her own age. Her nerves and occasional temper require a patient, mature man which he feels himself to be, and he stated very seriously that he would always take care of her.

***

JANIE MAGUIRE

Born 1924. Admitted in 1938 at age 14. First trial visit in 1952, with discharge in 1957 at age 33. A 1938 Revised Binet gave IQ of 55, while a 1955 WB's scores were Verbal 65, Performance 81, Full Scale 71. Familial.

This is an older sister of Marion Maguire. Home conditions were apparently morally relaxed at best. Referring to the girls of this family, town selectmen feared that "one of them may contract a disease and become a menace to the community" which fear says something about the community as well. (In our case histories, many communities seem to have been seriously menaced by 14-year-old girls.) A rather undistinguished patient at PSS, Janie exerted considerable magnetism toward males on her trial visits, and eugenic sterilization preceeded but did not prevent the birth of a child in 1955. The interviewer's account follows:

Patient was located in Thornton, Massachusetts by telephone calls to all nursing homes or rest homes in that town (our info. was that she was so employed there). The initial interview, unannounced, at Elm Wood Nursing Home, met with resistance, with one slight waver. A follow-up letter, noting that we would have to get the information from her ex-hub, produced a phone call from her and an interview the following Sunday.

Before discharge Janie had attracted the interest of a Mr. Feeney, who managed a rest home in Majorport. A former PHTC Social Worker, Purity Higgins, evidently projected some of her own personal problems onto the patient.

As a result of these various interactions, Feeney, Higgins et al seem to have engineered a marriage between patient and a Theodore Roosevelt Thayer (b. 1918) who was apparently a veteran being temporarily (and only temporarily) dried out at Feeney's rest home in Majorport. Janie would still have been quite pretty at this time, 1957. She left PHTC in a triumphal blizzard of orange blossoms, satisfying Feeney and Higgins dynamics. T.R. Thayer also payed off the last of Janie's hospital maternity bill that Miss Higgins had swatted her with to teach her the high cost of sin (over $600, and they took the baby away, too). Thayer's prior wife had divorced him for "cruel and abusive treatment."

This seems to have been a rather rocky marriage -- running from 1957 to 1963 (with intermissions), at which later time Janie divorced him. His alcoholism continued, and he could not hold steady jobs, so worked more or less as a free lance accountant and tax man, netted maybe $5,000 a year, says Janie (but maybe less). She says they were thrown out of a number of rentals (housing). T.R.'s father, she says, was a lawyer -- but T.R. had only high school education. He was not totally incapacitated by alcohol, but it decreased his economic effectiveness.

After a time, Janie had enough - evidently Teddy was doing the "cruel and abusive treatment" bit again (Janie turned up to work at Mrs. Nickerson's Nursing Home in a black and blue and bruised condition, at the conclusion of her marriage). The Thayers complained that her departure left them without a housekeeper, and Janie said to T.R.'s father, it wasn't her responsibility to see that he got a housekeeper, was it?

This was in 1963. J.G. reports that patient's lawyer tied up some $7,000 in savings of T.R.'s and was paying out $15/week to patient for recompense for her care of T.R.'s elderly father and T.R.'s retarded brother, both seemingly a part of this household.

After a spell of maybe 6 months work at Mrs. Nickerson's Nursing Home, pt. migrated to Thornton, Massachusetts, where she has been for the last 1½ years, working as a "practical nurse" at the Elm Wood Nursing Home, a modern and quite attractive structure built three years ago, which cares mostly for the elderly infirm. Five days a week, 7 A.M. to 3 P.M., occasionally a 6th day, but no time and a half for overtime. Janie lives solo in a nearby rooming house of rather decent appearance, L to LM (she deprecates its exterior, however). Of possible second marriage, she says defensively that she certainly doesn't intend to stay single for the rest of her life. In view of her past interest in opp. sex, it would seem possible that this interest is still alive.

Janie was initially (first interview) defensive and resistant. What right did we have to be asking her questions, checking on her? Didn't she have her discharge? She would ask her lawyer about this, etc., etc. But several other themes ran along here: 1) pt. as a "bad girl" -- didn't she make enough trouble for them when she was at PHTC? 2) pt. as a "stupid girl" -- (less emphasis) 3) Pt. as completely independent, able to take care of all her own affairs, needs no help from anybody, especially no help from PHTC -- this last theme is variously and spontaneously repeated in different contexts.

Initially, there were also a number of inquiries as to whether or not I had revealed anything about her PHTC background to her employer or fellow employees -- much concern about this -- (I had, of course, not) -- and for the second interview, I wasn't to come into the nursing home, but to wait outside in the car. Her Mass. residence and place of work are kept secret from many of her Maine acquaintances, and especially from her ex-hub, with intercommunication here being through lawyers. The second visit met more resentment, with requested assurances that this follow-up business wouldn't be repeated again. There were some irritated reactions (on principle?) to parts of the questionnaire, but when Janie forgot herself, she was amiable. I had promised never to see her again, but on departure, she vaguely remarked, "Well, I'll see you...."

I would now think that what had seemed, from just the information in her pre-discharge case history, to be shallow affect is rather a kind of blunting of painful reaction in the face of a series of basically depressing life experiences, and that she has areas of sadness, areas of might-have-been, simmering regrets that are pushed further underground (than in e.g., the case of another female dischargee, eugenically sterilized, who asked, "Why did the state take away from me the best years of my life and butcher me, too?"), and an unfavorable self-picture ("bad girl," "stupid girl," perhaps "crazy girl"). She is capable of occasional resentful statements, but has no over-all pattern of organized resentment. (J.G. reports that she has trouble with occasional alky binges. However, she has been here 1½ years, steadily.) The matter of savings, and possible further education in nursing touch some notes of inner concern.

Although a somewhat ravaged 41 (more so on second visit than first?), Janie still presents a quite trim and attractive appearance, with white uniform, jet black hair, high voltage blue-green eyes, and pleasant but somewhat coarse features that read better at a distance than close up. In her work at the nursing home, I imagine her slightly blunted affect and basically sympathetic nature would prove rather soothing to disestablished ancients.

She is also socially quite perceptive, as e.g., in some of her remarks about PHTC personnel: re a certain dynamic and driven M.D., reflectively, "That man.... I wonder if he will ever find any rest?" Or re a certain astute social worker under a new and trying director, "I guess she can take care of herself all right?"

There are perhaps some latterday personal affairs we are not getting at. If there is still the $15/week payment from T.R., this may delay a re-marriage (if it is seen as alimony).

This patient gives no evidence of retardation. Despite educational and home handicaps, and long institutionalization with its various effects, and a rocky second-hand marriage, now ended, she appears to be doing relatively well economically and emotionally.

***

In the next case, a partially free-loading mate's better features combine with a dischargee's economic and emotional stability to make what seems to be a workable marriage. As noted before, the dischargees took what they could get -- and the husband in this case is by no means the worst catch of all.

EILEEN HARDING

Born 1923. Admitted in 1939 at age 16. Trial visits began in 1953, with discharge in 1954 at age 31. A 1939 Revised Binet scored 57. A 1951 WB had scores of Verbal 67, Performance 85, Full Scale 76.

When Eileen was 9 her mother died. Two foster homes later, H&W sent her to PSS because of problems of adolescence. She did excellent work at a nursing home on trial visit, and was well liked, but surprised everyone by allegedly "going haywire when she got her freedom" and running off with a married man named Jefferson. The interviewer's account follows:

> The Jefferson abode is off Route 17 via dirt road a mile or so. It is a slightly run-down and modest white building with a barn attached. I was greeted by two barking dogs and after some time, Mr. Jefferson. Mr. J. is young looking, forty or so, good-looking, and quite friendly. He explained that his wife was at work as her day off was no longer Tuesday.
>
> Mr. Jefferson married Eileen after seven years of living with her, or as he put it, "going steady." He is recently divorced from wife #1, has some teen-age children by said marriage. The Jeffersons have been floating about the state -- Eileen always steadily employed -- Mr. Jefferson not always steadily employed. Mr. J. has a sixth grade education, is quite verbal, but explains that he has no trade. His employment sessions are seasonal, i.e., sardine factory, etc., but fairly lucrative, $75/week or so.
>
> Eileen own a car which hubby says he bought her as a present, a 1961 Ford or thereabouts. She cannot drive this, however, but hubby says he is teaching her.
>
> Eileen now works at a nursing home in Bournemouth six days a week. Hubby says that this is a good job and she gets minimum wage here where she didn't at some of the others. In the past Eileen has worked in Serfboro, Majorport, So. Majorport, Granite Head, True, and Oldham-Elycroft. Frequent job shifting has been due to hubby's migratory job searching. Hubby is now "looking" though he has a sure job in June. He might like to work before, he muses.
>
> Mr. J. reports his wife has a passion for animals, especially horses (there are pictures of horses all over the house), and because of this he purchased an aging racer from the Tunbridge Track. Eileen rides this horse (bareback) occasionally and spends "hours" caring for it. In addition, she paints (by numbers) and makes her own clothes.
>
> Mr. J. is very friendly with people in Stanton Center and also Mrs. Iolanthe Mallory (who hubby says is related to ex-pt., Anna Crawford, but did not go to PHTC from her foster home), a nursing assistant at PHTC.
>
> The only thing that bothers Eileen about her past, says Mr. J., is that she cannot have children.
>
> Eileen sounds quite competent and seems to have no great employment or personal problems. Whether hubby's frequent unemployment will cause trouble in her marriage is, of course, uncertain. Eileen seems to take the initiative in this marriage while hubby provides companionship, some type of emotional support perhaps.

***

A "Housekeeper" is a more or less single lady who lives in the house of a more or less single gentleman and conducts whatever distaff activities may be required to keep the home well ordered and happy. In this quite permanent relationship, the persons are usually in their middle or later years, and the relationship is almost always without issue. This arrangement affords a safe haven to the lady, an orderly household to the gentleman, and pleasant companionship to both. (The prospect of issue, with younger partners, would result in marriage.) Community stigma is absent.

Three examples are given. These are somewhat less than half of all such relationships in the entire dischargee population and therefore the sample is proportionately much too large. However, as these cases are quite similar to others where a formal marriage is recognized, and because they so generously follow the spirit rather than the letter of the relationship, they are presented here.

With the first, Julia Marston, companionship in old age is represented. The second case, of Caroline Rogers, is quite typical of the older widower who protectively takes a somewhat younger female dischargee under his care, this case being less "two against the world" than with Linda Maloy and her husband described above. The third case, Irma Folsom, although without benefit of clergy, approaches an egalitarian level in its own manic fashion.

JULIA MARSTON

Born 1903. Admitted in 1918 at age 14. First trial visits not until 40 years later in 1958, when she was 54. Discharge in 1960 at age 57. A Revised Binet in 1918 scored 58. In 1953 a WB's scores were Verbal 75, Performance 81, Full Scale 75.

Julia was the youngest and only surviving one of 4 or 5 children born to two very simple souls who reacted by indulging her every whim and feeding her too much. Ensuing social problems saw her sent to the State School for Girls (correctional), and then trans-shipped to PSS. Frantic and continual parental attempts to free her were in vain. In 1918, her "ambition in life" was "to be with parents." Eventually both died without the reunion being achieved. On a series of trial visits, she did extremely well in caring for elderly invalids. The interviewer's account follows:

The house in which Julia Marston resides is a shaky two-story structure resembling a partially closed accordion. The side door is surrounded by pansies, geraniums, and roses arranged chaotically.

I was greeted by a rather irate Julia Marston who pressed her face to the screen and told me that she was discharged, had her papers to prove it, and for that reason wanted nothing to do with "that place". Almost as suddenly as the tirade began it ended, and J.M. opened the door to her pad. This turned out to be her home chez landlord - a seventy-eight-year-old man who has a history of strokes.

Inside the apartment there are four rooms. Each is an endless parade of objects leaving the rooms poorly defined and personality-less. It seemed like a large collection of things none of which had more importance than the other.

Julia was quick to explain that her apartment was on the second floor and that she was chez landlord to watch television. However, she later conceded that she resided here most of the time as the doctor did not want her to do the stairs.

Julia is an obese woman who weighs 270 lbs. In late 1960, she states, she had a heart attack. She is also plagued with high blood pressure and various other physical ailments both real and imaginary. Julia is eager to obtain the listener's sympathy and praise, and she seems to need it badly. She proceeded to list the ills she had endured and then began listing the things she had made and done in the last four and one-half years. Unlike the room arrangements Julia does have a list of important things. She has not forgotten her departure from home at an early age and the death of both her parents. She had hoped from the beginning years to be reunited with her parents, and their deaths were particularly heartbreaking. She then focused her attention on an aunt who died shortly before her discharge in 1960. She now visits a cousin in So. Majorport often and has learned from them the details of her aunt's death. She repeats these details over and over for as long as one will listen.

In Morganton, Julia has found companionship with her landlord in the winter of their days. The two are quite inseparable. They go for drives together, minister to each others ailments, and buy each other presents. Julia does the housekeeping and the cooking. Another companion is a Mrs. Howe who has befriended Julia since her discharge. J.M. has contact with other ex-pts. in the area and evidently has known many of them from childhood.

Julia, who strikes one as having once been potentially normal, is now too old and in too poor health to support herself. She receives seventy-four dollars OAA a month, the bulk of which goes for medical expenses. Her rent amounts to nine dollars a month. Julia must take several kinds of medicine daily and see a doctor twice a month. She is supposedly on a diet but stated proudly that she often consumes two one-pound boxes of chocolates at one sitting. She states matter of factly that she was born fat and is going to die fat.

By no means an inactive woman, Julia sews for money and at Christmas made some thirty dollars selling wreaths that she had made. She displayed objects that she had made for my approval and these showed that J.M. is indeed skillful at handicraft. Once a week she goes to the Salvation Army where a group fashion dolls out of foam rubber. These dolls are then sold for the benefit of the Army.

Julia states that she can read and write. "At least," she says, "I can do that." She shows a fondness for PSS-PHTC despite her outburst of earlier. J.M. said that she recently attended the Fourth of July celebration at PHTC and was saddened by the fact that the people she knew are all gone. It was her home for many a year, but still she did not give up the hope of uniting with her family.

Julia insisted upon showing me her apartment upstairs; I think, perhaps, to make sure that I believed that it existed. This was tidily arranged, and filled with photos of her parents, aunt, and other beloved relatives (most of them are dead). It took Julia almost fifteen minutes to mount the stairs and when she reached the top she was breathing very hard and red in the face. It is understandable that the doctor does not want her climbing the stairs.

Julia seems to be managing well in her post-discharge situation. She has several supportive relationships which I think have aided her in her adjustment to the community.

***

CAROLINE ROGERS

Born 1924. Admitted in 1937 at age 13. First trial visit in 1956 at age 32, with discharge in 1959. The IQ was 68 on a 1937 Revised Binet, and scores on a 1955 WB were Verbal 78, Performance 79, Full Scale 77.

Her father died when Caroline was 3 years old, and she passed from the care of an inadequate mother to H&W, which sent her to PSS 9 years later. Trial visit performance at only one location for three years was good. The interviewers' accounts follow:

(First interview attempt, by Miss B.)

I arrived at C.R.'s via instructions from the Post Office. The house, white, is a large two-story structure, probably split into two apartments. I was entering the driveway when a plump, gray-haired lady came running out waving her arms frantically. The lady, stuttering and out of breath, said she was Carrie; seemed very agitated. She spoke very rapidly, still waving the arms. I _must_ go talk to her "mother," Mrs. Woodman, at the bottom of the hill!

(Repetition of this in a nervous voice, at least three times, followed by directions to the abode of her mother.) C. said she had worked for her for years and would feel better if I talked to her first, constant repetition of this. I agreed, C.R. sighed in relief, smiled warmly, and gave me a big thank you. I tried Mrs. Woodman, but found her out.

(Second interview attempt, by Miss D.)

In trying to interview Caroline, I encountered the same opposition experienced by Miss B. about a month ago. She most emphatically refused to answer my questions until I had talked to her past TV employer and "adopted mother," Mrs. Woodman. Mrs. Woodman, a nurse and former PHTC employee, lives only a short distance away but was not at home. Since Caroline had indicated her "employer," Edwin Bouchard, would be home at one o'clock and "would like to see me," I waited until that time to call again.

I explained at the door that Mrs. Woodman had not been at home, but with Mr. Bouchard present, Caroline didn't need any persuasion and invited me inside immediately. She turned me right over to Mr. B. who was sitting in the living room reading the paper.

Edwin Bouchard is a well-groomed, rather handsome man of French-Canadian extraction, who looks at least ten years younger than his seventy-one years. He has been employed by Elmford Dairy for twenty-nine years, delivering the raw milk to various processing and distribution plants in the Morganton - Majorport area. He is very calm, well-spoken, although not educated beyond the sixth grade. His wife of some forty odd years died about five years ago and Caroline, who had helped take care of her at the terminal point in her illness, stayed on as his "housekeeper."

Mr. B. was obviously supporting Caroline in her anxiety over the survey since he was not at all threatened or belligerent over the interview but only wanted some clarification as to the purpose of it. He did say he was quite familiar with the school, having lived in this area for many years, and he had many negative feelings about it. In particular, he expressed strong opinions that many people had been put there as an unloading operation by relatives and others. He cited Caroline as an example, stating that she was every bit as capable and responsible as the average person walking the streets. His criticisms were presented in a calm, rational manner and tempered by praise for Dr. Bowman and resulting improvements in the Training Center.

This five-room house, which he and Caroline live in alone, is owned by Clifton Woodman who employs Mr. B. (rent of $10/wk. is deducted from his paycheck). This is a fairly attractive white-frame house but the inside walls are badly in need of either paint or new wallpaper. Caroline says she does all the cooking, cleaning, ironing, and washing - this latter duty being amply demonstrated by a sizeable wash drying on the clothesline. She said she had learned to cook by watching her mother, but that here at PSS she had not been allowed to attend cooking classes. (I might add here that the presence of Mr. B. had an amazing effect on Caroline who changed from an agitated, stuttering, somewhat belligerent person to a relaxed, talkative, rather friendly woman.)

This relying on the strength of others seems also pretty evident in her relationship with the Woodmans who are "mother" and "father" to her. This "adopted," middle-class family extends to the Woodman's son, his wife, and children -- with all of whom she has a strong, affectionate identification. Her natural relatives she has disowned because of their disinterest and neglect. She has kept her whereabouts a secret from them (some sibs live in Majorport) for she says if they knew where she was, they would probably try to get some money out of her. Mention of her natural mother brought out the strongest rejection response (mother now deceased).

Caroline also feels very vindictive towards her former close friend, "Aunt" Dalrymple, because of some supposedly exploitative behavior. Mrs. Dalrymple boards two State children and got in the habit of bringing the children to Caroline to feed and care for whenever she had to be away from home. It was Mr. Bouchard who finally put a halt to this because Mrs. Dalrymple was paying them nothing and abusing this privilege with ever-increasing frequency. Caroline said she wished she had the letter that Mrs. Dalrymple wrote her so that I might see how abusive it was. It was apparently filled with allusion to Mrs. D.'s past kindnesses (especially during PSS stay) and Caroline's subsequent ingratitude.

At the time of Caroline's release via TV to the Woodmans, she had the sole care of Woodman's invalid mother during the hours from 3:00 to 11:00 when Mrs. W. was on duty at PSS. This elderly woman had had a shock which left her almost totally dependent (had to be bathed, fed, was incontinent, etc.). It was after her death that Mr. Bouchard, through his association with Mr. Woodman, had arranged for Caroline to take care of his wife. They both spoke of this as an employer-employee relationship. Caroline receives $10/wk. plus full maintenance.(?) They hold each other in warm regard. Mr. Bouchard asked if I didn't think Caroline looked well (she is very stocky as is Mr. B.), and as regards any anti-social acts (Caroline is allegedly light-fingered), Mr. B. said he would know if she had had any trouble in the community.

Some residual anxiety was apparent when, toward the end of the interview, Caroline said that should anything happen to Mr. B., she would always have a place to stay with the Woodmans. It was obvious that she was fearful of the remotest possibility of having to return here.

***

IRMA FOLSOM

Born 1926. Admitted in 1937 at age 10. Trial visits began in 1955, with discharge in 1959 at age 32. IQ of 63 on a 1937 Revised Binet. IQ of 79 on a 1958 Stanford Binet. Another "familial".

Irma's father died when she was 4. She was in H&W custody and foster homes from 5 until PSS admission. Her mother was the product of a very marginal family. Emotional stability at PHTC was somewhat limited. The interviewer's account follows:

Irma was another of our ex-pts. who was very difficult to locate as she is so secretive with acquaintances about her address. Her mother had lived at one time with a Mrs. Hopkins on Summerfield Ave. and this nice-appearing woman has a personal interest in the family, but even she, although receiving periodic phone calls from Irma, had not been told where Irma lived or anything of a personal nature. It is perhaps just because of her diplomacy in not asking too many questions and accepting Irma on her own terms, that our ex-pt. has continued this contact. (It is also perhaps a loose tie with her mother who has so strenuously disapproved of her present company.)

The interview took place in my car as Irma did not want anyone at the apt. house knowing her business. Among our females, Irma is as distinct a personality as Rose Barton. She is a kind of female 'bon vivant' who describes the different facets of her life in euphoric terms often emphasized by knee-slapping and rib-nudging. Everything is turning up roses, according to I.F., who goes into raptures over her job, her man, and her social life. There is a manic, comic element in her conversation which covers over her tension, nervousness, and all the short straws she has drawn.

For the past five years, she has been living with a fifty-year-old bachelor named Howard Weiss, who works at his father's shoe repair shop and draws SS pension for some physical disability. His health is a worry to Irma as he has diabetes and gall bladder attacks. Because of several love disappointments in the past, he is too wary of females to get married, worries that Irma, too, will leave him someday. Irma says importantly that he is a high school graduate, brother to a Majorport physician, and has a cousin who is a dentist (joking reference to free shoes, medical and dental treatment). Lately he has been talking about buying a place of their own, but at present they are living in a one-room apt. and eat their meals in restaurants. He is Jewish but not of the Orthodox faith, which in some ways is disappointing to Irma who thinks that the ceremonial observances are very beautiful. She has made some study of the religion but says it is very difficult to understand. In particular, she has tried to get him to observe Yom Kippur which is her favorite ceremony, but he tells her that having gone through so many of them, it is tiring, repetitious, etc.

They are now living in a very presentable apt. house on Whittier Square. The tenants, several of whom I met while waiting for Irma, seemed to be very pleasant. This couple has lived in the Whittier Sq. area most of the time. A former residence, the Center Motel, is also quite nice, seems to be run by an elderly couple. Irma said there had been a fire there, set by some child playing with matches and that was the only reason they had moved.

Irma makes much of her job at the Majorport Lobster Co. where she has been steadily employed the last four years. There are the usual seasonal slumps, but whether she makes a lot of cash or a little, it is all gravy to her. She says, in reference to her over-all situation, that she feels like a millionaire. Prior to this job, she seemed to have had an on again, off again housekeeping job with an elderly lady on Summerfield Ave. over a three-year period, but finally this woman had gone into a convalescent home. One summer she filled in at Majorport Medical Center as a ward maid. Irma had tried to get accepted at the Venus School of Hairdressing in Majorport, but needed two years of high school in order to qualify. This kind of work interests her. She said she cut her own hair and had dyed it a light gray.

J.G. informs me that Irma used to be very thin; but she is now a stocky 175 lbs. This announcement, uttered in her habitual grandiose style, was made early in the interview as part of the news she wanted passed on to J.G., along with assurances that she has learned to control her temper. Irma is sensitive about her PSS background and cautioned that I should not let this info out to anyone as Howard does not know about it.

Relations with her mother are strained with bitter feelings on both sides (but she still seems to keep close tabs on mother's whereabouts). Several times she had met her mother on the street and got asked for loans which she scornfully refused. She said her mother had married again to a man named Prince, but they are separated and she lives alone and works in Boston. There have been acid comments from mother about her relationship with Howard, terming this as "being mixed up with a bunch of kikes."

When she and Howard had a car, they had traveled about on weekends through New England and last Fall on a trip to Canada, but they had been in several accidents which stove up the vehicle.

Irma likes beano, going to dances, and occasionally to the night club at the Valencia (this latter said with a coy shrug of the shoulders). Her exuberance is over-played, she is childish, but quite likeable and maybe trying to make up for lost time.

***

Below the lower limits of a respectable class system is a still lower class, and this the middle class member looks on with serious disapproval. Although some cultural relativists may invent a convincing apologia for this lowest class, it is actually quite difficult to see it as one which, if left to its own devices and absolutely isolated from the rest of society, could perpetuate itself without substantial change of form.

The latter social level has been the area of origin for a number of our patients. Many parents at this level do not function with notoriously good mental health. And when families break up at this poverty stratum -- through death, desertion, or whatever -- children often pass to state custody and to foster home placements, some of which in their own way have scarcely been an improvement over previous conditions. In the past, many educable children followed this route to the institution.

This lower or lowest allowed social class level is one to which a few of our dischargees have also returned, and as a part of the total post-discharge picture it requires description. Two examples are given of more or less workable and functioning marriages. The first, of Minnie Lester, is in a rather rural setting in a more remote, non-coastal area of Maine.

The second case, of Winslow Forrest, is in an urban setting, and touches on a special group whose members are mostly PHTC dischargees and their siblings. It is probably grossly unfair to identify this group as lowest class, as most of its members do not function at a socially rockbottom level, but the group is most certainly in many ways one apart. One such group formed in Majorport, and another in Morganton -- both urban areas. With the passing of time, the groups seem to lose perhaps some of their cohesiveness, with individual members dropping out or widening their social networks to other fields.

Perhaps the real function of such a group is a transitional one, giving a sense of social unity and genuine support to individuals who have shared a minority experience, and helping them to adapt to and integrate with the rather foreign and at times rather hostile larger society.

MINNIE LESTER

> Born 1935. Admitted in 1952 at age 17, trial visits in 1956, and discharge in 1959 at age 24. A 1954 WB gave scores of Verbal 63, Performance 70, Full Scale 62.
>
> A product of the "notorious Lester family," Minnie had been sent to State School for Girls (correctional) at 17 on a charge of promiscuity for profit. She was transferred to Pineland because of her lower mental level. Family ties were close, she worried about her parents, often felt "discourage," and would cry in her room on trial visit because she didn't have her freedom, which had been promised to her at 18 when she went to SSG. The interviewer's account follows:

I had stopped by the P.O. to find directions to Old West Rd. and found no one had heard of it. They suggested the city welfare office, and they sent me to Lake St. in search of Minnie's sister Phoebe (also a dischargee).

When I arrived on Lake St. I found a row of rather shabby and dirty homes.

I then encountered Mrs. Lester (mother) who has some kind of a speech defect which causes her to leave off various phonemes - noticeably, "S", "T", "N", "M", "D". She was rather unintelligible and after she repeated the directions three times at my request I managed to decipher enough to get to Minnie's abode. Minnie's home is located a short distance from the city dump. There are three tar-paper shacks in a row amid a debris of cans, papers, rubbish, etc. Frolicking in this debris were a slew of cats and dogs.

My greeting was rather cool. Minnie appeared ready to tolerate my presence but it was apparent that she could not care less whether I came or not. She was a stocky, buxom woman, with shoulder length brown hair. She remained at her placement in Majorport only a short time - long enough to find Frederick Corey and then return to the family stamping ground in Rangifer. Like many of the other girls, she feels she has achieved respectability as the result of marriage. She is, because of this marriage, "off the state." Corey does not seem to be too steadily employed but rather works when work is available. By odd jobs he is, she said, able to keep enough on hand to support them. She added proudly, "He doesn't want me to work." Because of the good crop of potatoes last fall and the fact that they are just beginning to be loaded and shipped, hubby has been steadily employed since last October. Jobs are so plentiful now that he is able to do side work.

Minnie amuses herself by reading comic books (mostly love stories) and doing sewing. In addition she has a slew of animals: 5 cats, 2 dogs, and a bird which she cares for.

Minnie had comments to make about another sister still at PHTC, and expressed much resentment of PSS-PHTC.

Minnie and hubby seem to be living at a subsistence level. Minnie and the rest of her family seem to display a great deal of resentment toward "the state," and probably anyone of authority. These people seem to live lives of cultural deviants. They are, at least, unwilling and unable to subscribe to the main stream way of living. The family seems to function as a cohesive group and is very closed. This second generation has seemed to learn how to live suitably enough so they are not "bothered" by others. They are still a great concern to town officials in Rangifer and evidently live on, much to the horror of many of the denizens of Rangifer.

One might suspect that quite a bit of inter-marriage or in-breeding may result from this rather cohesive group.

Minnie seems, at any rate, stabilized because of her marriage and able to get by without continued support from state and municipal authorities. She seems, also, as if she would be able to earn her own living if this were necessary.

***

WINSLOW ALEXANDER FORREST

Born 1940. Admitted 1952 at age 12, trial visits in 1958, with discharge in 1959 at age 19 and "capable of self support." Familial, with educational deficit. A 1953 WISC yielded scores of Verbal 62, Performance 89, Full Scale 72. A 1955 Porteus gave IQ of 86, and a 1957 HTP scored 96. Binets were lower.

His mother deserted, his father later acquired a "housekeeper" and young "Sandy" started a one-boy theft-wave in the town of Rostock that eventually sent him to State School for Boys (correctional) at age 11, with transfer to PHTC a year later. Here, he seems to have had more mental horsepower than others, was a "leader" (this threatened a few staff members), and was not really objectionable or disobedient. He was one of the first few to get a license through the new driver education course.

A number of dischargees and their siblings in the Majorport "group" are mentioned in passing, and Martha Forrest is Sandy's wife, in the interviewer's account which follows:

> I had made an appointment through Martha Forrest to talk with Sandy. Upon my arrival at the apartment, however, Sandy and Roger Frizzell, who is currently living with them, had gone off to do some mechanical job on a car. Martha said Sandy should be back momentarily. Several times when cars drove into the parking lot, Martha would remark this must be S. returning, but he never did show.
>
> Martha Forrest appears to be the 24-carat gem of the outfit. She is pretty in a frail sort of way, shy, sensitive, and quite perceptive. When she gets nervous there is some stuttering, but she appears to be a "giving" sort of person, more selfless than Fran, and quite possibly more so than other women in this group. In this sense, I would think her influence quite strongly felt in smoothing over some of the rough edges.
>
> Her attitude towards her husband is one of affection and indulgence. In going through a book of snapshots, she would point out Sandy as, "There's another picture of that happy-go-lucky guy!" She says, with obvious satisfaction, that Sandy wonders what would have become of him if he hadn't married her. He was awfully "wild", she says, before their marriage, but she sees herself as a steadying influence. The same sort of affection and pride is shown toward their daughter, Robin, who is now 2½ years old and a pretty little child. The couple were married in 1962.
>
> Sandy was living at the YMCA at the time of his discharge and working as a dishwasher at Howard Johnson, then a car wash, and finally, six months at Shireport Shoe (pulling lasts) where he made $50/wk., but was restless, dissatisfied, and wanted more money. Since that time he has held a number of different jobs but all having to do with auto mechanics which he enjoys, is good at, and he manages to hang on to each of these jobs for longer periods of time than was previously the case. He has worked at Majorport Transmission, Ajax Auto Supply, Majorport Trucking, and for Ben Bannerman, a used car dealer on Woodland Ave. Eventually, however, he quits these jobs for some vague reasons (tired, restless, discontent). During the stock-car racing season he works as a mechanic's helper at the Bainbridge Speedway in Westborough (a particularly favorite hangout for many ex-PSS), and he hopes to race himself this season. During periods of unemployment and at other times, he picks up extra change with free-lance mechanical tune-ups and other minor car repairs.
>
> Sandy is perhaps more capable than many of his friends besides having leadership qualities. His name has come up many times as someone known to our ex-PSS males, which in some ways may be a little like "name-dropping." Many of the boys are "car-crazy," so his abilities as a mechanic are a "prestige" item and his connection with the raceway a rather glamorous, exciting frosting on the cake. There is a definite note of admiration (among females, too) when his name is mentioned in the category of "the person I would most like to be."
>
> As with any hero, however, he has his Achilles heel, which seems to be most prominently a deep resentment against his mother which comes to the surface when he is in his cups. She had walked out on the family, took off with

some guy when Sandy was six. Martha speaks of this with understanding and compassion. (She was a "state child", she says.) His own sympathy and loyalty is towards his father who still lives in Rostock and has apparently married again. Sandy had lived with them awhile after leaving the YMCA.

He and Martha have separated twice for brief periods due to economic straits, she going to live with his father in Rostock, and Sandy staying with Jeff Sherman and other friends on another occasion. Together they have also lived with Martha's foster mother and with Clyde Marsh. As with the Lumsdens upstairs, they have moved about considerably in Majorport.

During his bachelor days, Sandy shared several apartments with Roger Frizzell and Ernest Park, both of whom have also lived with this couple for several months at a time. Frizzell has been with them for about three weeks but is planning to move back to Morganton where he has a job. Martha explains that the stags in this group are lonely, need to have some home life and company, so they have taken them in. Sandy can't say "no" to anyone, says Martha, but he is beginning to draw the line a little. (No mention of these fellows paying any board.) Gerald Dagostino and wife had stayed with them a week or so, but there was some trouble over their not paying board, and Sandy had ordered them out.

Frizzell, Park, and Marsh are Sandy's closest buddies, but he has a wide circle of friends in both Majorport and Morganton. (BAB mentions that Sandy appears in Morganton quite often.) One thing I thought that might be quite characteristic of this group was a tendency of the males to band together bachelor style a little more often than the usual "boys night out," but there is also the kind of devotion to spouse typified by Ivy Allen and Martha Forrest. If there is much female resentment over the boys going stag, it has been only hinted at here and there.

The Forrests have collected City Welfare in the past and regularly receive surplus food, but there was apparently some trouble with Welfare because Sandy had refused to work for the city as a condition of getting Aid, and he used to send Martha to the office to collect over the objection of the welfare people, who expected the head of the house to report. They have apparently not had any help for the past year or so. Sandy just got his job with Majorport Trucking less than a week ago and had been unemployed several months before this, but Martha has been working at a fish factory and as a part-time waitress when extra help is needed during banquets, weddings, etc.

Before I left, Martha wanted me to see a book of snapshots -- there were lots of pictures of Sandy posing beside the cars he has owned, some in which he was a bit "oiled", as Martha good-naturedly pointed out, photos of some of ex-PSS, and a rather curious photo of Roger Frizzell's father lying in an open casket. This latter, Martha said rather softly, was perhaps out of place. There was the usual wedding photos, snaps of daughter, Robin, and Martha's grammar school diploma (she completed 1 yr. HS), and a penmanship certificate she had been awarded. I got only a passing glimpse of a newspaper clipping with the headline, "16 year old So. Majorport girl missing," so I don't know to whom this pertained.

The apartment is shabby but it was very clean. In the living room Martha showed me a picture of herself with a church choir group. She said she used to sing in church regularly - a little hesitation, then the remark that she doesn't get to church very often anymore. (I wonder if she was fortunate enough to get into a good foster home - she seems to place emphasis on the conventional values.)

Shortly after the interview began, Victor Lumsden came down the back stairs and wordlessly entered the kitchen. He is of average build with red hair and a rather florid complexion. He added a few remarks, mostly of admiration for Sandy. Without Sandy, Martha may have felt the need for some support, possibly also plain old curiosity on his part. Victor is pleasant but he has a very pronounced stutter. He seemed quite eager to co-operate in regard to how I might arrange an interview with Geraldine and Clyde Marsh. He was also going to see Ernest Park at work and ask him to get in touch with me.

Martha did not recall that Sandy has had any arrests, other than an overnight stay in jail for intoxication.

***

The section that follows is concerned with several types of "non-successful" social performance and with certain non-successful aspects of behavior in otherwise acceptably functioning individuals. More than half of the 11 cases cited represent extremes of undesirable social performance. Had even a 5% minority of dischargees behaved at these extremes, the entire discharge program would clearly have been in serious difficulties. These extremes are presented here to illustrate, as fully developed syndromes, certain elements that do occur with much reduced force in larger numbers of the discharged population -- not to the extent of disrupting social and economic performances but certainly to the extent of limiting their fullest achievement.

Many of the dischargees in which these elements do exist are those who would seem to have a higher potential for performance than suggested in previous sections describing more dependent individuals. Illustration of these elements should help to provide insight into the problems of this quite special population with its often unique heritage of social and psychological experiences.

Because of higher mental level, some of the dischargees described below did not really qualify as bona fide retardates -- or, for other reasons, did not seem to be classifiable primarily as retardates. They are however not unrepresentative of some of the individuals who pass through an institution for the retarded.

No attempt is made to give an elaborate psychological or psychiatrically oriented analysis of the pathologies that seem to be involved, as such an effort would be beyond the province of this supplement.

Four cases of female dischargees are presented. These are undoubtedly among the very "worst" if not the worst cases encountered in this category. One is a sociopath seeking refuge of sorts in a correctional institution. The second would appear to be a case of full blown psychosis at large in the community. The third, by way of comparison, is a lower level retardate socially overcommitted. The fourth case is that of a wholly respectable community member who is paying a considerable price for her success; here, extreme and deliberate non-functioning in certain social areas is substituted for the external controls or malfunctioning in the prior three cases.

ALICE ALLEN

Born 1942. Admitted in 1955 at age 12. Discharged to custody of Health & Welfare in 1958 at age 15 as "Improved. Capable of higher academic work than provided here." While a 1956 Stanford Binet IQ was 71, this test by 1958 placed the IQ at 82.

Before admission, home life included parental alcoholic parties and other chronic Saturnalia into which Alice was indoctrinated early by her father and his friends. When the father was sent off to a state mental hospital, the mother acquired a resident boyfriend. Alice had severe behavior problems in public school. At the time she was sent to PHTC, other siblings passed to H&W custody.

The manner of dealing with the effects of these childhood experiences by seeking sanctuary and some kind of orderly, externally imposed security in a correctional institution are described in the interviewer's account which follows:

Alice is a rather chubby, but pretty young girl with large brown eyes. She is about seven months pregnant and quite infatuated with her predicament. This is her second confinement with the WR (Women's Reformatory) and came about at her request.

Her first stay was in 1959, when she was charged with assault (assaulted woman in foster home and County Sheriff). She was on her own for two years, and although she had personal difficulties, she remained out of legal trouble. She was a housekeeper in Maxim Falls for a man and three children. She was having interpersonal difficulties there (exactly what is not known). She went to her probation officer in Majorport and asked him to send her back to WR. He explained that this was impossible since she had committed no offense. Alice then asked him what she needed to do. Feeling that they should prevent such purposeful crime, it was arranged with a judge to have Alice charged with disorderly conduct, a misdemeanor still carrying WR sentence. No one knew that she was pregnant at this time (it is not known whether Alice knew it or not). When it was discovered, Alice claimed that her father had molested her and that it was his child (the father had been formally charged with this some ten or more years ago). A letter was sent by Mother to WR and to Alice, quite reasonable and well-written, chastising Alice for this accusation. The mother reminded Alice that there was a police record which would verify the real situation. Alice, it seems, went to the police and accused six boys of raping her. After investigation it was found that she had solicited the boys, and a number of witnesses to this fact were found.

During the interview Alice was quite coy, and attempted to gain my attention by emphasizing her pregnancy. She said that it was her father's child and looked up expecting some kind of shock. When she did not succeed in obtaining this reaction she repeated it again. I pressed her further for attitudes toward family and peers. She said her mother always took her father's side, but her sisters were "good pals." She said she liked her aunt and uncle best. She mentioned Mrs. Wilson, a warden whom she calls "Mother." I asked her what she was like -- Alice responded that she was "old," had a nice personality, and had taught her right from wrong.

When asked about the future, Alice said she planned to stay at WR. "What if you are released?" I asked. Alice stated that if so she would "go out and do something to make them take me back." "Why do you like it here?" I asked. "Oh, it's more like home to me and I belong here." "Why do you feel you belong here?" "Dunno" (followed by a giggle), then, "I just like it here."

Alice admitted she did not get along with the other girls and said that this was largely her fault.

Superintendent's Comments:

Alice is a loud, aggessive girl in her second stay here. We do not feel that her problems are mental. Her IQ tests here have yielded the following results:
1959: V-82 P-116 FS-94
1963: V-87 P-100 FS-92
1964: V-89 P-111 FS-100

Psychology feels that her potential IQ is even higher.

We feel that while it is possible that Alice is carrying her father's child, the mother's story is more likely. Alice's accusation and the following investigation are authentic.

During her second stay here, her behavior has not improved. She is full of verbal aggression, needles other inmates, and cannot maintain a successful personal relationship over a period of time. She is extremely cruel to animals. If someone has a sore arm or a sore leg, she is sure to knock it (passing it off as an accident). She knows how to manipulate weaker members of the staff and knows enough to stop when she has gone too far.

In 1962, under observation at Dirigo State Hospital, she was diagnosed as having a character disorder, sociopath.

Psychological Report - 1964:

Psychologists feel that she was asking for help by seeking readmission to WR. They continued to state that she is lonely, lacks self-value, and feels unloved and worthless....

The Superintendent further stated that Alice is the problem child of the institution. She has been in the problem unit for the duration of her stay. She has a violent temper and an acid tongue. Under stress, she uses physical violence, verbal attacks, lies, and tantrums. Alice craves attention and attempts to get this through wild behavior and a booming voice (if this is her intent, she has succeeded in bringing uproar to the institution and can pride herself on that fact that she is its No. 1 problem).

She has not responded to treatment, and what appeared to be, at first, an attempt to get help, now seems to be Alice's way of establishing a negative identity.

Her attachment to (or identification with) Mrs. Wilson, who is, interestingly enough, a young, pretty woman in her early thirties, has not been encouraged. In fact, it has been played down as much as possible. Alice writes letters to "Grannie Wilson," who she met only once. "Grannie" has never responded. Mrs. Wilson has been moved to another building and has not encouraged Alice at all.

The Superintendent was quite pessimistic about Alice's future. She feels that Alice will never be able to maintain successful personal relationships and fears that she will continue to pursue a negative identity indefinitely. Hope still remains, but the possibility is regarded as slim.

This girl seems to be bothered solely by emotional problems, no doubt resulting from her early homelife. There seems to be little the institutional setting can do to avoid reinforcing her pursuit of a negative identity. She probably will stay in the care of the State for the rest of her life.

MELISSA WILLIAMS

Born 1928. Admitted in 1952 at age 24. Trial visits in 1959 with discharge in late 1960, at age 32. Stanford Binet IQ of 48 in 1953. A 1956 WAIS scored Verbal 64, Performance 77, Full Scale 68. A 1956 HTP scored 78.

The illegitimate child of a woman mentally at a low imbecile level, Melissa was born amid the spiritual and material affluence of one of Maine's Indian reservations, and cared for by a maternal grandmother until the latter's death. She was teased and tormented and driven into rages by other children and adults. At 14, Melissa left the reservation to live with an aunt and uncle in So. Majorport, and seems to have picked up a fair education there. By age 19 or 20, she returned to her mother, who had despite mental level been more or less self-supporting by chopping wood and hauling water. This visit precipitated a wild psychotic break and institutionalization of the mother. Melissa herself then entered a period of unbridled promiscuity and alcoholism, and was shipped, pregnant, to Cardiff State Hospital (mental) in 1951, and thence to PHTC in 1953. Following a period of emotional disturbance, she appeared to become stabilized and was discharged as capable of self-support on a trial visit placement. The interviewer's account takes up the subsequently disastrous story:

Windward Point Reservation is located slightly off the highway which runs between Amundsen and Thuleport. The area is full of rocks, red beach, and open on both sides to the ocean. Here, there are forty or so pre-fab homes, all the same style, intermingled with some shacks. I was told that the U.S. Government built the homes for the reservation two years ago. These homes, although relatively new, show signs of poor treatment and are beginning to look rather shabby. In the center of this village is a Catholic Church built in the 1800's known as St. John's Mission.

As one wanders through the village, one is struck by the large size of the families (these are combo of illegitimate and legitimate children) and the number of relatively young men, 25-40, sitting at home in rocking chairs. It was later explained that only five or six men in the village work while the others remain at home supporting their growing families on government pensions. The village has its own school facilities but these are very limited.

Melissa Williams is a wild-eyed young girl, bordering on obesity, with thick, black hair in complete disarray. Her Aunt Tessie is more Indian looking than she, with sharp features, and a rather dignified appearance. Aunt Tessie is an extremely thin, complaining person in her sixties. She is rather shrewd, especially regarding money and interested in getting as much material comfort (at someone else's expense) as possible. Although these two women live in a shack, the abundance of material possessions on the inside is quite a sight to behold. Aunt Tessie has, she states, cancer, anemia, heart disease, and ulcers. She is rather preoccupied with these real and/or imaginary ills. She is eager to impress upon one her financial needs and the great cost of her supporting niece, Melissa Williams.

Ex-pt., Melissa Williams, has recently given birth to her third child (second since discharge). The father of this child has fled to parts unknown. Aunt Tessie is quick to excuse herself from all responsibility re this. Yet her rather contemptuous attitude toward everything but Melissa's AD pension makes one question her as Melissa's supervisor. Mrs. Black continually reminds Melissa of her baseness and tells her she is an evil person. Melissa, on the other hand, has a "half-here" quality about her. She seems unaware of how she gets pregnant, stating that she does nothing. According to Aunt Tessie, she has pulled out the newborn baby's navel, thrashed him wildly when he cried, and other violent things. The baby has since its birth spent two weeks in the hospital because of the navel episode. Melissa, however, states in a far away tone that she did not do anything.

Aunt Tessie complains of her fatigue, stating the hours it is necessary to tend the baby. She is adamant that it should be removed immediately, and it took every bit of persuasion I had to convince her I could not remove it. She threatens to do something to the baby if it is not removed. Melissa is somewhat proud of the baby as something which she produced, but stated that she does not like it especially when it cries.

Melissa Williams upon discharge was working at a placement in Majorport. Two days following, she ran away to Aunt Tessie's home in Ridgefield. She has remained with Aunt Tessie since that time with occasional time out for love affairs. Melissa seems to have no affect for the men she lives with - in fact, no affect for anyone at all.

Aunt Tessie and Melissa lived in Majorport until a year ago when Aunt Tessie decided to go to the reservation for free rent. Now she hopes to return to Majorport where the Welfare Workers will work for her. She occasionally threatens to put Melissa back at PHTC, but these threats do not seem to have any effect on Melissa.

Melissa Williams sat during the interview, her hands shaking. From time to time she chewed on her skin and fingernails. All told, she has the appearance of an extremely disturbed young girl.

The people of Thuleport, especially the men, hold the Indians in contempt. They are continual problems to the Police Department re their liquor and sex offenses. The women are regarded by the men of Thuleport (allegedly) as their personal property. (They have somewhat the same status as the lower class negro woman in the South.) Attitudes such as these expressed by Aunt Tessie seem to be reinforced by the government's policy re the Indians. The situation has produced people without hope, without anything to lose, and with a rather parasite-type relation to their environment.

Melissa seems to be at first disturbed - leading to a retardation. Her present situation is certainly not ideal, not supportive, or in any way helpful in meeting her needs. It would seem also that it is extremely doubtful that it will get better. She will probably continue to produce illegitimate children until she is institutionalized.

***

MAXENE LINDSEY

Born 1920. Admitted in 1949 at age 29. Trial visits in 1959, with discharge in late 1960, at age 40. A 1949 Stanford Binet gave IQ of 44, with little change in 1954. A 1949 Goodenough scored 60.

Born illegitimately to a highly migratory mother, Maxene was reportedly adopted at an early age by a Mr. Lindsey and wife, themselves of passable but perhaps not too stable personality. Exposed to but not too much affected by public schools from age 6 to 16, Maxene apparently stayed sheltered and at home with the adopting parents until she was 25. The adopting mother died at this time, and there followed a period of confusion; there was an illegitimate baby that died, and a liaison that some foster relatives objected to, and Maxene was sent to Women's Reform-

4

atory, and then to PHTC. At the latter she was an undistinguished patient. Discharge to Self with Conservator followed several unspectacular trial visit placements. Her considerable mental limitations, the inadequate Mr. Black as husband, and the burden of child care, all combine to cause the very poor performance noted in the interviewer's account that follows:

The Black abode is located in a rickety LB-B apartment house on S. Center Street in Chester.

They have a three-room apartment here. The kitchen was quite clean and freshly painted. In the bedroom, bed clothes were extremely dirty; there was no heat, and the beds were unmade. Two little urchins were running about sucking baby bottles. These children were extremely dirty and unkempt. Both, girl - age 3, and boy - age 2, climbed aboard my lap for the duration of the interview. They seemed in great need of attention and appeared to be programmed for future disaster. The girl, age 3, is convulsive and cannot talk in words yet. The boy does not talk at all, although he walks with ease. Neither is toilet-trained. Mrs. Black is a stout, masculine woman whose blue eyes occasionally show a spark of kindness. Her manner is extremely gruff. When I appeared she began yelling: "What have I done now?" After a while she appeared to calm down.

There was one very striking thing about Mrs. Black: She could not conceive of time, or years, and seems very confused when pressed about this.

As I entered, she was screaming at her children for some misdeed -- and said in the middle of the interview that they were bad and she was sorry she had them. Through the influence of Morganton welfare, she had her tubes tied (hub at this time, unemployed). She claimed she had an appendectomy to deliver her second child (probably Caesarian delivery).

Hubby was absent during the interview, and Maxene said he was probably out drinking and added, "But I can't help that."

Both Maxene and hubby had met at Riverhead Poultry where they worked about two years ago; Maxene did not know how long, but said it was a long time. It was intimated that the girl, age 3, had been born before the two were married.

Both children were covered with bruises.

According to Mrs. B., her hubby had a "good job with good pay." The job is with the city of Chester. Maxene, however, did not know what kind of thing he did. This, however, is the first job he's had since Riverhead. Maxene said that soon "my old man will look for an apartment for us."

Maxene said that she did not roam the streets "anymore" as she was "a married woman now." She insisted on this so adamantly that it made me wonder a little. She said she spent her days next door with the McMores; hubby of this household is drinking companion of Mr. Black.

She seemed a little afraid I was interested in taking her children from her and insisted her children had the best of care.

This woman appeared to me to have a mental handicap (she also cannot read). She appears generally lax in housekeeping and with her children. They, the children, appear to be neglected and mistreated. Mrs. Black also appears to have a harsh and cruel manner with the children, and if she displayed good behavior during my presence, no telling of what they are subjected to.

Mrs. Black appears to have difficulty adjusting to personal relationships as she handles all with a "chip on her shoulder" attitude. Her personality problems, poor marriage, and mental handicap, make her adjustment a particularly poor one. She does not seem capable of handling these relationships adequately.

***

ELAINE DEXTER

Born 1939. Admitted in 1952 at age 13. First trial visits in 1959, with discharge in early 1961 at age 21. A 1953 WISC gave scores of Verbal 69, Performance 65, and Full Scale 64. In 1959 scores on a WAIS were Verbal 74, Performance 68, and Full Scale 70. Epilepsy with mental deficiency.

Elaine's father was apparently a no-good alcoholic whom the mother divorced when Elaine was about 8. He moved out of state, was remiss in child support payments, and eventually was heard from no more. Elaine had seizures from an early age, was an increasing behavior problem at home and at school, where her seizures upset other students. At PHTC she was at times moody, a "loner," had (according to psychology) a low self picture and rigid personality, but could respond to teaching. Her personality improved and in her second (and final) trial visit she was deemed a good worker and liked by the proprietor, staff, and patients of a nursing home. The mother's interest in Elaine continued through the institutional period.

Post-discharge adjustment is economically most successful, but the price paid to stay safely aloof from the social areas so disastrous for the previous three cases is a high one. There are two accounts, the first being the regularly scheduled one. The second account, a year later, is given by another interviewer who purely by chance was a neighbor of Elaine's.

Account No. 1:

Elaine has lived apart from her mother for about a year now. Her apartment, although on Center Street, is located some distance from the business district. She is an immaculate housekeeper, and the rooms are pleasant and well furnished, says Mrs. Dexter. (Elaine was not at home when I called on her.)

This mother-daughter separation may not be a serious break as they live near each other, go places together, and have at least weekly contact. This arrangement appears to be quite necessary if they are to have any kind of harmonious relationship. Elaine is described as a "loner" in our records, and her personality as pictured by Mrs. Dexter confirms this. She is very independent, withdrawn, resents advice or inquiries about her personal affairs, and prides herself on her self-sufficiency. What interpersonal difficulties there are seem confined to relatives, for she maintains good, if superficial, relations with neighbors, employers, and townspeople. She has only one sibling, a brother, William, who also lives in Bournemouth, but her behavior has more or less alienated her from him and his family. Her expectations are too rigid for them to understand. Mrs. Dexter explained this by stating that her son or daughter-in-law might meet Elaine casually on the street and tell her they were coming over to visit at some specified time. If they came say fifteen minutes early or late, Elaine would not let them in, or, if they did not come at all, she seemed to seethe with resentment and anger which no amount of explanation could change. After one of these misunderstandings, Mrs. Dexter related how she had brought Christmas presents from the brother, etc., to Elaine's apartment, and our ex-pt. had said she didn't want them and threw them out the door. Behavior such as this has occurred often enough so that William and his wife have just about written her off and suggested that Mrs. Dexter do the same. There is a cousin who has made a little inroad in her armor, Mrs. Dexter thinks, for lately Elaine has let this relative help her get her groceries back to the apartment. Heretofore, Elaine had not allowed anyone, including her mother, to assist her even this much.

Mrs. Dexter has been hurt by her daughter, also, it seems, but she has a good sense of humor about it as well as insight and tolerance. Elaine never comes to visit her, but two or three times a week Mrs. Dexter will go to Elaine's apartment not knowing whether she will be ignored or greeted "like a long lost relative." Sometimes Elaine will not answer the door even when her mother can hear the television or phonograph going, and when later Mrs. Dexter asks her for an explanation, Elaine makes all manner of lame excuses. With the passage of time, Mrs. Dexter has tended to become quite philosophical about it.

Elaine dislikes intensely gossip of any kind. She is quite apt to snap angrily that she doesn't care anything about what this one or that one is doing. It is perhaps part of this same characteristic which causes her to react curtly when townspeople inquire about her mother. Whether or not this gets misinterpreted by them, Mrs. Dexter feels that it is employed as a kind of conversation-stopper against further, perhaps more personal, questions.

Elaine lived with her mother about two years just prior to moving into her own apartment. Her stepfather, Herbert Sprague, died in 1962, and she and her mother lived alone in the house until they were forced to move out through legal action taken by Mr. Sprague's children. (The house had been owned by the first wife, therefore, Elaine's mother had no legal right to it.) Elaine had made it clear that she did not intend to share an apartment with her mother because she objected to the menfriends her mother entertained in the home. Apparently there had been many arguments between them over this, perhaps even physical blows, and Mrs. Dexter had held firm, told Elaine that if she didn't like it, she could stay in her room. (Wonder if maybe the mother's behavior prompted the legal ouster. Mrs. Dexter makes her husband's children sound like ungrateful monsters, said she had cared for both her husband and his father through their illnesses.) The only solution was for each to have her own apartment.

It is interesting that Elaine seems to have fared much better than her mother from this point on. She found a very presentable apartment which at $75/month is more than her mother could afford. Mrs. Dexter ended up in some dismal flat, within her means but too far below her standards. Finally, through one of her employers, Mrs. Dexter arranged to live in with a fairly well-to-do elderly widow who needs someone for company and to be near in case of illness. This is a kindly old lady who has allowed Mrs. Dexter much latitude as to having visitors, etc., and she has a very attractive room, but it is still quite a comedown. In addition to this, both mother and daughter work out as domestics to multiple employers, and here again, Elaine, who works longer hours, makes more money than her mother and likes to point out this fact to other people. This rankles her mother some, but I think Mrs. Dexter is nonetheless impressed and proud of the progress Elaine has made. (She gives Pineland a lot of credit for this, and also mentioned how much she felt the Parents and Friends meetings here helped to promote understanding of the retardate and his problems.)

Mrs. Dexter, although she seems lacking in refinement, is a direct, honest, and thoughtful woman. In commenting on her duaghter's behavior she stated any number of times that she was no psychiatrist, yet it seemed that she has a keen perception of what works for her daughter and what does not. She understands why Elaine is at her best working alone where she can perform at her own pace and in her own way. Elaine is considered a capable and hard worker by all her employers, many of whom are professional people. (Weekends she works an additional five hours cleaning up offices.)

In money matters, our ex-patient is very frugal, has saved $3,000. She pays cash for everything, apparently not believing in charge accounts. (Her mother contrasts this with her son who makes an excellent salary as a welder but spends his money as fast as he can make it.) The only area where Mrs. Dexter felt there was a lack of judgement was in Elaine's tendency to overstock on grocery items that are on sale. In purchases of expensive appliances (stereo, TV, etc.), Elaine also refuses to turn in used appliances as a down payment, but this is perhaps more a reflection of her independent attitude towards her mother who had originally given her such items. Instead she returns these second-hand things to her mother where they simply get stored away and forgotten.

Elaine is not interested in men at all, and this puzzles her mother. Mrs. D. is looking for some tangible explanation and wondered if Elaine had been sterilized while she was at Pineland. (I told her that I did not believe that any such operation had taken place and that in any case, this would not have drastically altered her sexual interests.) Mrs. D. recalled that at one time when she had received some medical treatment here, Elaine had complained of stomach pains and her mother wondered if this might have been the result of such an operation. Then, very thoughtfully, Mrs. D. stated that Elaine had never gotten along with either her father or her stepfather. She very much resents her mother's interest in men because "she really wants all my attention," Mrs. Dexter said.

Elaine's striving for self-sufficiency is foreign to her mother's make-up. Mrs. Dexter stated that she liked men, needed their companionship, and could not be content to live alone. Whenever the subject of her remarriage has been mentioned to Elaine, our ex-patient has become angry and disgusted with her mother, advising her rather strenuously not to get into another mess. (Since the legal tangle following her second marriage, Mrs. Dexter had legally had her name changed from Sprague to Dexter, and she would have gone back to her maiden name were it not for the children, she said.)

Whenever Mrs. D. has questioned her daughter about friendships, Elaine has stated rather haughtily that she has lots of friends, but her mother knows of only a few girls, including another ex-pt. with whom Elaine associates. It seems that however complex and ambivalent the relationship, it is her mother with whom she is the most companionable, for Mrs. D. has a car and takes Elaine to the stock-car races, State fairs, etc. Our ex-patient is very timid about going places on her own for she lacks the confidence to use public transportation. Her mother has known of Elaine to walk three or four miles to avoid taking a bus.

Elaine remained at her discharge job with the nursing home in Dark River only a month or so before she returned to Bournemouth to live with her mother and stepfather. Within a short time she had accepted employment at a home for boys in Majorport. Here she did a very creditable job taking care of all the laundry for some two-hundred people besides supervising the boys who worked in the kitchen. The stepfather's death seems to have coincided with her voluntary decision to leave this job after a year to return home. Elaine told her mother that the work was getting too much for her to handle. Since then, or for the past three years, she has hired out as a domestic and done exceptionally well, as noted.

NOTE (For Account No. 1): Although Elaine is epileptic, she is very conscientious about taking her medication and has only an occasional and very mild attack. Otherwise, there have been no health problems.

Account No. 2 - about 1 year later:

Elaine Dexter, a dark-haired, plump girl of neat appearance, is regularly employed as a domestic by various Bournemouth families, all of whom highly recommend her. Elaine lives alone in a small, well appointed and tastefully arranged apartment of the first floor of the writer's residence. My overall impression of Elaine drawn from our residential proximity has been that of a rigidly independent, self-contained and withdrawn individual who accepts no interference or assistance from anyone, including and especially her family. She frequently refuses to welcome overtures or visits from her mother, who continues to initiate such attempts, and does not acknowledge her brother.

The following episode occurred on the evening of Sept. 13. Prior to this on Sept. 9, a neighbor had reported "loud bangs" coming from the downstairs region. Deciding that these sounds originated from the landlord's workshop, the neighbor made no investigation. However, on Sept. 13, one of Elaine's employers contacted her mother stating that Elaine had failed to report for work, a highly unusual occurrence. Mrs. Dexter, on presenting herself at the door of Elaine's apartment failed to elicit any response from her daughter. She called the town policeman who obtained a skeleton key from the landlord. Upon entering, she discovered that Elaine had been ill for several days, had smashed various utensils and had been severely banging her head against the wall. A doctor was called and a sedative administered. Mrs. Dexter thereupon departed to obtain nightclothes so that she could spend the night with Elaine. Upon her return, Mrs. Dexter discovered that Elaine had locked her out. The writer contacted the police and a similar entry was made. As the writer returned upstairs, loud voices and bangs were heard, making obvious the fact that the sedative had yet to take effect. Equally apparent was that Elaine vehemently did not desire her mother's presence. "I can take care of myself! I don't need anyone! Why don't you go home and leave me alone!" Her mother attempted to explain that when one was sick one needed help and that she, being Elaine's mother, wanted to stay with her. Elaine continued to voice loud and increasingly violent protests against her mother's presence. The result was an outbreak of anger on both parts with Mrs. Dexter screaming: "You act like a two-year old," and "I'll send you back to the State School if you don't behave." Another outburst of bangs accompanied this, and Mrs. Dexter yelled: "Elaine, you're a nice girl, don't do that to me." - Silence - Fifteen minutes later Mrs. Dexter appeared at the writer's door to report that Elaine had physically forced her to give up the skeleton key and had torn her wrist watch off. A cut on her wrist was noticed. Over a cup of coffee Mrs. Dexter stated that Elaine had not been taking her medicine regularly. (Elaine had a few grand mal seizures while at Pineland but none since. She is supposed to take Phenobarbital and Dilantin.) In addition, E. lived on coffee" and did not eat adequately. She also stated that Elaine worked too hard. She offered the information that she had beaten Elaine that evening in an attempt to subdue her.

In speaking of her daughter, Mrs. Dexter manifested pride and interest in her daughter's achievements and life despite resistance on Elaine's part. However, her good intentions and perceptiveness regarding Elaine appear to turn to anger when actually faced with Elaine's behavior. This would derive from a sense of frustration over her inability to win Elaine's love or acceptance. In speaking of their relationship, Mrs. Dexter evidences a sense of humor concerning Elaine's conduct toward her (See earlier report). She continues to feel a "mother's sense of responsibility." She states that Elaine is "too withdrawn" and "too cut off" and that "this is not good for anyone." Therefore, she tries to be close to Elaine and induce Elaine to go places with her; however, Elaine repulses this.

It is the writer's impression that Elaine definitely needs help; however, her extreme independence and self containment make acceptance of such assistance very unlikely. In addition, her resentment of her mother makes Mrs. Dexter an unlikely candidate for fulfilling Elaine's needs. Nevertheless, Elaine has become increasingly withdrawn in the past few months, a withdrawal that apparently has resulted in neglect of her diet and medication and finally to illness and breakdown. I feel that unless some way is found to break down Elaine's barriers that a more severe repetition of this episode will probably occur.

Continuation note, about three years after Account No. 2:

Elaine is reportedly still functioning at this time as a reliable domestic employee for Bournemouth families.

***

The remaining cases in this section are of male dischargees. Two extreme examples of rather constant residents of correctional institutions are given below. They represent two somewhat different psychosocial etiologies and two somewhat different reaction styles to these etiologies. Permanently imprinted social reactions of simmering anger, low frustration tolerance, apparent affectlessness, and fragile interpersonal ties are among those characteristics that occur in some of our dischargees who have come from pathological family backgrounds and multiple foster homes. Most such dischargee symptomatology of course falls far short of the crippling extremes cited here.

JAMES MOORE

Born 1944. Admitted in 1958 at age 14, and discharged to mother 6 months later as "not mentally retarded." In 1955 before admission, IQ was described as in the 45 - 60 range. At PHTC however, a battery of tests in 1958 gave the following scores: Stanford Binet 80; Porteus, Goodenough, and Columbia in the 80 - 83 range, with a wide scatter to higher levels.

The home environment was extremely poor. An alcoholic father had deserted when Jim was about 7, and the mother, also an alcoholic, was extending profitable hospitality to servicemen from a nearby base. Housing was in the worst slums of the town, and Jim's older brother was running with a tough, delinquent crowd. Jim had been in regular public school classes, then in a special class, and then suspended from school at age 13. Asthma, theft, property destruction, and behavior problems at school and at home were some of his symptoms.

Two accounts follow -- the first of a visit to the dischargee's home where his mother, his brother and brother's wife are encountered. The second visit is to the dischargee himself at State Prison. Although his higher mental level disqualifies him from formal classification as a retardate, it also gives him a higher degree of expression and communication regarding conditions and etiologies that have also affected retarded dischargees.

The home visit:

She said she wanted to wash and wax the kitchen floor. Someday she would do that. Somehow you got the impression that she was never going to but would always be going to do it, as if washing and waxing the kitchen floor would miraculously clean up her life. One could see that she was once very beautiful. Now she had the look of a run-down slut. She talked while her hands shook in a mid-alcoholism or post-alcoholism, puffing on her Chesterfields, dressed in a bathrobe. Her legs were swollen and full of varicose veins. And the eyes had seen a lot. She was at her wits ends about Jimmy and I must help. She was grateful that I came. I explained about the survey, and there was a silent recognition that once again she was faced with an outsider.

Tommy came in the room, a handsome dark-haired boy of twenty-two and asked who it was. It was the woman from Pineland, she said. "God damn," he said, "that's all that Jim needs is to get shipped down there again." I told him he needn't worry about that. He was bitter, and one could see that emotion just exploded from him. The phone rang three times in five minutes, and the last time he answered it, "Grand Central Station." I laughed, he laughed, and he began thinking I might be alright afterall.

She was full of conflicting emotions - she thought her son was sick, mixed up, but was bitter at the remark of a welfare agency that he was crazy. She wanted him home, but she couldn't stand it. She recognized the truth one minute, "that the boy had been through hell as a child," and denied it the next. She spouted moralistic phrases that might as well have come from Polonius. She ranted against drink and, yet, you wondered if she had finished her struggle against it.

Jimmy had been in and out of prisons since he left Pineland -- SSB, MR, and MSP. The longest he has been home is four months. The first time he took the rap for a friend. They were playing on grandma's lawn and Jimmy stood there while Freddy threw kerosene on a match. Freddy was younger and more frightened and Jimmy said he did it. Freddy later set another bigger fire, got caught, and went to SSB, too. Escape from there sent them both to MR. Jimmy and a bunch escaped from there. Jimmy was caught one block from his home by six policemen with machine guns. Tommy looked at me and said, "Yeah, four boys between 17-20 with no guns, and they faced them as if it were the Civil War or something." For this he got Peterson. Out of MSP last Dec., he came home, exploded, took to drink, broke into a laundrymat successfully. They decided that for kicks they'd try it the next night to see if they could get away with it again. They didn't. He's never had a lawyer - such luxuries are for the rich. The court order or warrant was wrong - the birthdate was wrong, various other things. Tommy tried to fight for a habeas Corpus. The verdict: "The word of you and your family don't mean nothing in the town."

Tommy was talking now - as if he had to talk. He seemed to be talking frankly - things came out that conventionally would have set me against him, so it couldn't have been calculated. I saw it as at least Tommy's truth. Tommy had had his share of prisons, too. He's seen SSB and the County Jail. His arrest came from assaults after drinking and assaults following insult. This has brought him behind bars many times, as he is insulted frequently. He finally blew town to Boston with wife and two kids to work. Work was only in the past month and a half. Prior to that time he was home and was, as he said, drunk for three months. If I had been in prison, I'd understand, cooped up in that small space, with constant do this - do that. You get out and you explode. He's seen lots of psychiatrists, and the last one, a guy at Hawthorne College who had donated his time free, really helped. Tommy recalled the second or third interview when he held a switch blade at the guy's throat. The psychiatrist sat there calmly still talking, and thus, won Tommy's respect. He seemed to understand his brother quite well because he'd been there.

He sat there holding his two-year old son on his lap. The trouble with his brother, he said, was "that he had been locked up with criminals all his life."

He talked a lot about prisons and what it was like. "They take your clothes off and chain your wrists to the bars." There was realization on his part that much could be improved. "If you are treated like an animal," he said, "you start believing you are one." He said that you cannot understand what effect this has unless you've been there. Talk is confined to good places to hit, methods of safe-cracking, and breaking in, and where they will try when they get out. Jim is presently in the same cell block with the man who killed his first cousin and his uncle.

The family has been mixed up in Rostock criminal activities for so long that the worst is expected of them. Tommy said he gets frisked frequently without cause. The police in town do not respect their rights as individuals. Their home is searched - they are searched. Tommy felt that if Jim got paroled, "he wouldn't have a chance." "You walk down the street and a cop starts to follow you." Then there is the crowd that looks upon Jim as Rostock's Saint Genet. He is a culture hero in the delinquent circles.

Jim feels that he is unwanted by all. He drinks heavily and has shown affection only for Tommy's little boy. He took care of the little boy for several days last winter. The little boy talked of Uncle Jim and smiled. Uncle Jim sends toys and presents even when he does not write letters to the rest of the family. "Its the only human thing that means anything to him." He is filled with hate and when he arrived home last November, he took a razor and cut the clothes and shoes the prison had given him in little pieces.

Tommy talked about the past while Semantha looked on morosely. Grampa has been going with the girl next door since he married grandma. Uncle (maternal) has a long criminal record, Father was an alcoholic; used to beat the boys with a rubber hose. Jim has a long jagged scar down the side of his face from where the metal nozzle struck him. Semantha took up with Navy personnel to get money for the family, and this continued until she was too old and too tired. She has turned to alcohol from time to time, may still. She said over and over - "No one takes a drink in my house."

One saw Tommy as hinging in precarious balance - you hoped he'd win the fight, yet, it seemed quite doubtful. This family rages with lower class fatalism, bitterness, hate. Each individual member seemed ready to devour the rest.

The possibility of Jim's salvation depends on how far his emotional problems have progressed. It is doubtful now that if finally given a decent environmental situation, he could survive the effects of the gutter he came from. As far as I could see, the success of the other two will depend on the same factors.

Tommy put the little boy down. His wife stood there with long blond hair and a face of blurred features. She was silent and had no form. He looked up and said, "Thank you for listening, and I'm sorry I talked so long." Tommy shook my hand and Semantha started cooking cod fish. And then I left them.

The State Prison visit (4 months later):

Jim walked into the visiting room, sat himself in the chair opposite me without once looking my way. He sat motionless as if ready to endure whatever must be endured. He did not wish to listen to explanations of what I was doing there or what the interview was about. There were times during the interview when he was almost friendly but he seemed to be trying hard to show no feeling at all.

Jim claims that following his discharge from PHTC he lived at home with his mother for a year. He was sent to SSB on a "trumped-up charge" because his mother would rather buy "booze" than support him. He was about sixteen then. Jim has been in institutions since then. After while, he said, "you don't mind it - you feel its the normal way to live."

Jim considers himself fit only to be employed in US prisons. The skills he has learned, he says, can only be used in such places. He expressed interest only in auto mechanics.

Jim seems fairly sure of one thing - he hates his mother. When on parole in Dec. of '63, he was paroled to her custody but she would not have him so he went to his grandmother and brother Tommy. Jim says he has no friends in the Rostock area. He was paroled to Rostock although he had secured employment at Riverhead Poultry in Morganton. Jim is very fond of his grandmother and his brother. His father, he says, only comes around when he is out of work and needs money.

Jim has been in the "pit" over twenty times. He says that he cannot remember how many. As Jim states, "I can take orders just so long and then I don't do what they tell me."

Jim will be paroled on April 15th to Chester. He is not sure where he will work, but has applied at various factories in the area. His success, he feels, will depend on his ability to stay away from drinking. Jim states emphatically that his drinking is "not a problem." It is purely and solely the function of the intensity of his boredom and the length of time he has been "cooped up." The drinking, too, is a release from home. All the crimes he has committed, says Jim, have been committed when he has been drinking.

Jim feels that only if he goes outside of Rostock will he have any kind of a chance to start afresh. His reputation is made in Rostock and they expect him to do wrong. Here, too, he is more apt to explode over town hostility and mother's drunken sprees.

Jim seems to have the very low boiling point syndrome. He also subscribes to a kind of prison ethics - the main tenet being, Thou shalt not "rat" on anyone. In addition, one should not show anything more than cool politeness to any authority figure. (He verifies this verbally.) Since this boy has been indoctrinated in this since he was sixteen or younger, I doubt that anything short of intensive therapy would reverse it. His adjustment in the outside world will probably be poor.

Notes from State Prison records:

Jim has been a continual discipline problem at the prison. His attitude and behavior lie somewhere in the poor-terrible range.

Psychological examination show that he is hypersensitively suspicious, excuse making, and has a low threshold for aggressive expression. He is hostile, sees himself as a clown, and feels he has been treated unfairly by authority figures. Jim is very distrustful and feels he must be on guard at all times, even with friends.

He was considered again for parole in Nov. and refused. His letter to the parole board showed a great deal of hostility and ended, "Thank you for your time."

Jim will be considered for parole again on April 20. A pre-parole evaluation visit to Jim's mother found her quite unwilling to take the boy when paroled. Jim's brother, Tommy, is in jail again. MSP officials were hesitant to place Frank with his mother and with his father. Both are alcoholics and father is continually in and out of jail.

When last on parole Jim was given a 9:30 curfew. If he was not in at 9:30 his mother would lock him out of the house. He drank continually during this period and returned to the home of his grandmother. In the form he filled out when he entered MSP he lists only his grandmother under relatives.

Jim has two tatoos which prison psychologist feels are indication of his needs and ways of attaining those needs. On his left hand is tatooed "L-O-V-E" while on the right is an obscenity for intercourse.

MSP officials feel that parole placement with mother or father would be detrimental as would any parole to the Rostock area. However, Jim is intent upon going to this area.

***

BERTRAND LESSARD

Born 1936. Admitted in 1945 at age 9. Some trial visits in 1957. Discharge in 1959 at age 21. "Familial". A 1945 Stanford Binet yielded an IQ score of 59. A 1954 WB scored Verbal 55, Performance 74, Full Scale 60. A Porteus at about this time scored 93.

When his putative father learned that Bertrand's mother was pregnant, he fled to Canada. Bertrand was born in Women's Reformatory, where is mother, described as a middle grade imbecile (of good family background), had come for similar accouchements. The early history is obscure. He may or may not have lived with his mother in infancy, but at least had some kind of sustained contact with her. When he was 7, he was being boarded by his town in a foster home rather peaceably. At 8 he passed to H&W custody, and three foster homes and one year later, had become a wild, incontinent behavior problem that was sent to Pownal State School. Here, in a later and more sophisticated era, his condition evoked lengthy analyses from psychologists, psychiatrists, and others, and diagnoses of psychopath, sociopath, and "loner" were among those recorded. His behavior was not actually too poor but he had a special talent for antagonizing almost everyone. He was discharged after rather indifferent trial visit performance. The interviewer's account follows:

Of the four men I interviewed at the State Prison, Bertrand is by far the most charming and ingratiating. He is very childlike with variable moods ranging from a brooding petulance to exuberant good spirits and unworldly optimism. I can well imagine a woman with strong mothering instincts being completely captivated by him - a mistake which could be fatal, I think!

Bertrand is a rather good-looking young man in his late 20's with black hair trimmed in a semi-crew cut. (All inmates have the same barber, I guess.) He is vain about his looks, proclaiming that his crop of black hair will never show any gray hairs as he will dye them when they appear. I don't believe the inevitability of growing old has ever seriously occurred to Bertrand, since he likes to believe that he has cornered the market on perpetual youth. Much of his charm lies in his being able to almost convince you this is true, touching on the child in all of us. He shows a keen, if superficial interest in girls. With a wide grin and slightly bowed head, he calls himself "lover boy".

Since his discharge in 1959, Bertrand estimates that he has had about two years of freedom. He had gone directly to Mascataquis to live with his mother who he says (with obvious resentment) had gotten married without letting him know.(?) After only a month or two she had announced her intention to go to Boston sans Bertrand, telling him he was old enough to be on his own now. Bertrand had been picked up for larceny of an auto (later changed to TCWOC) in December of 1959, sent to the Men's Reformatory and paroled in June of 1961. Later that same month and for several months following, Bertrand was picked up on vagrancy and intoxication charges in the Dirigo-Mascataquis area, until finally in December he was returned to the Men's Reformatory on a Disorderly Conduct charge. The same pattern repeated itself upon his next parole (5-22-62), but apparently during the latter part of 1962, Bertrand spent the greater part of 18 months outside the State of Maine, having touched Boston, Hartford, N.Y., Chicago, and his southern tour of Georgia, Fla., Ala., and Texas. He has never had any trouble with the law except in Maine, Bertrand declares. He hates Maine (once was apprehended in Kirkwell with even more than the usual dispatch), but of course he always returns to the state (probably when he has had all he can take).

There has been one notable exception to his aimless wandering which occurred in Hartford, Conn. when he apparently got in with an OK family, Mr. & Mrs. Dominic DiPalma, who seem to have been impressed enough to have tried to help him. They owned a small restaurant (Dom's Diner), hired Bertrand as a dishwasher, and took him in as a boarder in their home. Bertrand says he remained with them almost two years. He says he admired and respected them both, but in the end there was a heated argument over some question of money having been deducted for board from his pay without his knowledge (perhaps he thought they were maintaining him gratis). He lost his trust in them, felt they had been trying to put something over on him. He then upped anchor and continued his drifting.

In one of his more serious moments, Bertrand shook his head, squirmed in his chair a little in some mild form of self-reproach. He cannot understand why he has to behave as he does, but he says he cannot stay in a place more than a month or so because by that time his acquaintances become interested in him, start asking questions, and then he must move on.

He has an interesting way of calling his flights "vacations," but when I asked him how often he figured a person should have a vacation, he gave the conventional reply of once a year (for all year maybe?).

Outside of Maine, Bertrand goes by the alias of Billy Tucson Crosby (has a heart and name "Tucson" tatooed on his lower arm). He said there was an older man, a patient here, by that name. He had a girlfriend in Hartford who only knew him as "Crosby" (the DePalmas, too, perhaps). Bertrand had mentioned that he kept a separate apartment (with some of his clothes there in order to make a fast get-away if needed), but I wondered if perhaps this was not some intimate set-up involving this girl. It sounded as though she might be quite a bit younger than Bertrand. Her family had expressed concern that she would become pregnant by him, and they had wanted her to wait a year before she got married. (I would think this latter would be enough to scare our boy off.) She finally fell for a guy with a Cadillac convertible. Bertrand scoffs at this, says he would have loved and taken care of her, but if all she wanted was this Dandy, why, heck, he could have bought a car anytime. Possibly this event and the showdown with the DePalmas occurred about the same time.

Bertrand likes to drop in at the bars and chew the fat with the boys. He can glamorize all his travels, brag about the big money he made in Chicago on construction, and perhaps dazzle a few of his less discerning companions with his travelogues. The alternative, settling down in one place with a steady job, he automatically agrees is what he should do, but it obviously made little impression on him.

With his parole approaching, Bertrand already has his new dreams of conquest. This time it is a gal he used to know here (Mary Blanchard, also a '59 dischargee) and an ex-girlfriend of Gerald Agostino. With great relish, B. says she is a wonderful girl who is now an RN and making over $100/wk. Questioned, he admitted that they had neither corresponded nor seen each other, but Bertrand says enthusiastically that they spent fifteen years at PSS together, and she will know him alright. (I'm afraid that Bertrand may be in for another let-down, as Mary is apparently married and living in Mass.)

Bertrand's adjustment at both the Reformatory and the State Prison have been good. The Reformatory report of '63 reads: "Subject is completely institutionalized and gets along well with both staff and other inmates." At the State Prison he is a good worker, has been with the park crew the past two weeks. In his file there was one letter to the Classification Officer requesting a transfer from the sanding to the wood shop, because some of the boys were calling him names, but the records contained nothing of any consequence behaviorwise. The reform report describes him as "a personable, friendly young man who adjusts well to any situation."

Since 1963, Bertrand has graduated to a more refined level of anti-social conduct, having been imprisoned at the Reformatory from 2-15-63, to 1-6-64, for forgery. He is presently serving time for a similar offense at the State Prison, having been admitted there on Dec. 14, 1964. He is eligible for parole this Sept., but he is in a quandary as to whether he should accept parole with its stringent regulations or serve the complete sentence and leave there a completely free man. He says that chances are good that he could not abide parole regulations. It is his theory that parole officers hire guys to follow you around to report any violations. Otherwise, how come every time he drops in for a beer, it gets back to the P.O.? His full term sentence would keep Bertrand at the State Prison until Dec. of 1967, and I could hardly imagine his waiting that long for his reward. He did, in fact, wonder if I would speak to a former PHTC Social Service Director about getting him a job.

Whenever he is released, it would not seem that those of us on the outside will have the benefit of his charm for a very long time.

***

Only a small portion of our most troubled dischargees are the material that prison populations are made of. The others bear their difficulties and the effects of childhood experiences in other fashions. Two examples are given of seriously troubled individuals. With the first, it was a domestic trauma and probably continuing maternal influence that did the work. In the second case, causative factors were 3 or 4 years of an unstable home of origin followed by a number of years of multiple foster home placements.

ERNEST PARK

Born 1931. Admitted in 1950 at age 19. Trial visits began in 1955, with discharge in 1958 at age 27. A 1950 WB had scores of Verbal 72, Performance 67, Full Scale 67. In 1957 a Stanford Binet and a Porteus both placed the IQ at 80.

Ernest was one of several children born to a very marginal family. The mother was promiscuous and endowed with a psychopathic personality. She shared her bed with a daughter who, on occasions when the father was absent, would wake to find mother entertaining a strange man. When Ernest was 6, he and a sister were at home when the father bludgeoned the mother to what he thought was death (she survived) and then hung himself. Ernest was a state ward in a foster home for two years after that, then returned at age 8 to his mother and stepfather. When he was 18, setting a fire and the attempted rape of a young girl sent him off to Men's Reformatory, with subsequent transfer to PSS. Marked by emotional disturbance, his trial visit performance was mixed. Clean, orderly, and cooperative at first, he would become sullen and restless after a time. Two interview accounts follow, one is with his friends, and the second is with Ernest himself. His friends include some of the Majorport "group" noted in the Winslow Forrest case.

Account No. 1 (informants, Clyde Marsh & wife, & Mrs. Diane Lathrop, cousin):

Ernest has ducked out on attempts at an interview and reacted rather angrily to our survey. He guards his privacy even among his friends and relatives. He has stayed with a multitude of people since his discharge and yet he seems a particularly isolated figure. No one appears really close to him. It does not seem that he can stand to be with the same people for more than a month or two before he seeks a change, sometimes in a fit of anger but often because of some chronic restlessness and dissatisfaction. His friends call it boredom. He reappears from time to time to stay with the same people for another short period. Majorport is his stamping ground.

Ernest is a troubled person who evokes sympathy from all informants and others in the Majorport group who have commented briefly about him. They find his behavior faintly amusing and annoying but most of all puzzling. Diane Lathrop's husband felt very sorry for Ernest and wished he could get some help. He seems to the Lathrops to be a very moody, brooding sort of man who is quick to take offense and may suddenly slam out of the house over some trivial matter and not be seen again for months. He is no fighter in the physical sense, in fact, Mr. Lathrop did not believe Ernest could stand up to this kind of confrontation - he is instead a door-slammer with a pattern of behavior which is more self-punishing than anything else.

Diane Lathrop did not even know Ernest existed until about two years ago when he appeared at her apt. She is a young, attractive blond who has apparently been once divorced and has a brood of youngsters. Presently she lives three or four houses away from Fran Lumsden on Cambridge St. Even now Diane can't figure Ernest out but he is welcome there. He had been living with her for a month or so just before going to Connecticut two weeks ago. He is not a complete freeloader apparently. At least he pays room and board whenever he has money, but he has defaulted on bills around town.

Diane says he is not at all interested in girls. She had tried to fix him up with a date, all arrangements were made and agreed on and then, at the last moment, Ernest refused to go. Geraldine Marsh agrees with this and said she never knew Ernest to have a date. "A girl would need a pair of roller skates to keep up with Parky," Geraldine observed.

He is indeed a frequent traveller and job-changer. Clyde Marsh can only recall one job which Ernest held for as long as five months. He becomes restless and dissatisfied usually much sooner than this. As in more predominantly social situations, he has sometimes left in anger. Clyde worked with him on several jobs and would not rate him more than a fair worker - he acts too bored and lazy. His jobs have been mainly as a general kitchen man and dishwasher, but he has also done some construction work and his last job was tire-changing at Zenith Tire in Majorport. This was just prior to his taking off for Conn.

Through Manpower, Inc., Ernest was training to be a mechanic's helper but he did not complete the course and has never been employed in this capacity.

This is apparently the only formal job training he has had.

He has few contacts with his mother who lives in North Harbor. Clyde drove him up there to see her once, said that in his presence at least they seemed to get along alright, but suggested that this might not be the case when they are alone. Ernest had told Mr. Lathrop during a depressed spell that no one wanted him. The only other relative mentioned was a brother in Connecticut who Ernest may see when he migrates there. Of the people he is presently living with - at least the man is related through marriage to Mrs. Lathrop (her husband - they are now separated).

Ernest has seemed to acquire a fairly complex network of acquaintances through his various contacts in Majorport. Even so, he has stayed at the Salvation Army Shelter several times during very lean times.

From all appearances, Ernest is carrying on his own kind of cold war with society. It does not seem that he has had any serious trouble with the law. He is a man with enough intelligence and ability to get jobs rather easily and support himself in half-fashion. The slack is taken up by friends, sympathizers, or even casual acquaintances who take him in. (This unconditional kind of benevolence seems characteristic not only of many of our dischargees as a group but others as well who are at the same economic level.)

Account No. 2 (one month later)

Ernest Park phoned the office this date and in what seemed an unusually calm and accommodating manner, suggested we get together for a talk. Many months before when I had let it be known in the Majorport group that I was looking for him, there had been another call from Ernest. This one had been anxious, angry, and only after much hesitation, had there been a grudging consent to be interviewed. At the appointed time and place, he had failed to show up and later mentioned his absence as intentional to his good friend, Clyde Marsh. Today he said he had just gotten into town earlier that morning from Conn., and after giving me a description of his clothing so I could pick him out, said he would meet me in front of the Greyhound terminal in Majorport.

Driving towards the terminal, I spotted Ernest pacing a little in front of the building and occasionally peering inside even though I was slightly ahead of schedule. He is a rather short, pudgy man with sandy, crew-cut hair - thirty-four years of age and quite ordinary in appearance. Ernest approached the car after some hesitation, but his caution evaporated as soon as he was certain of my identity.

From what I could piece together, Ernest had arrived in Majorport around four-thirty in the morning from Conn. and had been rather aimlessly wandering around Majorport. Most of his friends were probably working, this being a Friday, and Ernest, as it turned out, was troubled in spite of his calm exterior.

He made some sheepish explanation to my joking reference to our first non-meeting, saying that he was probably in one of his depressed moods. Regarding the survey, he wanted to know if it was really meant to help get other patients discharged and expressed satisfaction at being able to help out. Ernest seems to have a great need to be helpful to others, or, at least, he likes to present himself in this light. His cousin, Diane Lathrop, had five daughters before she finally had a son, and Ernest thought it would have been much better if she had had more sons because, to him, they are much more helpful at home than girls. When I asked for clarification of this opinion, Ernest said boys could carry in wood, sweep the floors and things like that, whereas girls were apt to be too independent (and self-centered perhaps). During this part of the conversation, I recalled something Fran Lumsden had said about Ernest to the effect that when he stayed with them he would often tell her to sleep late in the morning while he proceeded to do the housework. "Funny guy," Fran had said in a kind of awed puzzlement.

For a half hour or so at the beginning of the interview Ernest allowed himself to be led through the questionnaire without appearing too involved in the process. He may have been preparing himself for what was really on his mind for when he did take charge of the interview and talk about his problems and the things that mattered to him, there was scarcely a let-up for the next three hours. At the same time he kept that part of me that was "the interviewer" at bay by keeping a wary eye on the hand that held the pencil.

Ernest is not an easy person to understand as his friends and relatives have already acknowledged, but a person instinctively sympathizes with him because he is alone in his trouble and not able to cope with his emotions. If I could mention only one emotion that seemed to dominate his action, I would say fear is the main thing and more specifically - fear of violence against himself and fear of losing control of himself. As illustrations of this, he mentioned the not infrequent threats of a fight near the end of drinking bouts with the boys when his immediate reaction is to get away before any such confrontation. A common enough reaction certainly, but coupled with less tangible threats still possibly significant. He, for instance, is glad he is not travelling about the country now because of the Civil Rights riots (he doesn't trust negroes but mentioned one, ex-pt. Harold Anderson, favorably), and he was thankful when he had quit a job training course because a fellow student had stabbed his wife sixteen times on the streets of Majorport. If he had been in the classroom with this guy, it might have happened to him instead, Ernest said. It was the frequency in which this subject of violence cropped up in his conversation which seemed to me the tip off that this particular fear might predominate. The fear of losing control of himself was specifically related to mental illness and Ernest said he would turn himself in to a State Hospital to get help if he ever felt he was going insane. (Two of his sisters have been at Dirigo State Hospital.) It was these things as seen in conjunction with the horror in childhood of having witnessed his father attempt the murder of the mother and then immediately commit suicide which seemed to be the central theme of Ernest's conversation. Ernest said he and his sister were the only children to witness this brutal scene between the parents. It is perhaps a bond between them although Ernest made it a point to say they each reacted differently to the situation which, as in many instances, made it appear that Ernest had no one who really understood his feelings. He acts very bitter against an older brother living now in Hartford. This brother, following the death of the father, had apparently, and through necessity as he tried to explain to Ernest, taken over this parental role for awhile, but Ernest became very emotional in relating this and said no one could ever take the place of his father and that this brother acted as if he was God Almighty or something. His mother apparently married three or four years after her husband's suicide. Ernest did not get along with his stepfather, resented him, but later, when emotionally removed from the situation, seems to have felt that the stepfather treated him well.

It was while Ernest was describing the silver plate (the size of a quarter) in his mother's head from the result of the beating received from his father that Ernest for the first time broke down and sobbed violently. "That's the kind of break I got," he choked. This was all he could say for several minutes until he cried himself out. He was not as self-conscious as some men are over such an emotional display, but he said immediately afterwards that he felt better and had held himself in too long. Several times later he cried briefly when talking about his relatives or when discussing an obsession he has developed to "clear his record."

Ernest, much against the better sense and advice of his friends, has conceived an elaborate and irrational scheme whereby he can show by signs of 'manufactured' stability and good behavior that his stay at the reformatory and Pineland should be stricken from the public records. To do this he dutifully will pay his poll tax each year, establish his residence in Majorport by giving a man five or ten dollars to make out a rent receipt twice a year at the same address, and finally put aside $25 per week of his income to eventually pay a lawyer to present his case.

Ernest is bitter about his stay at Pineland, not only because he didn't belong here but also because of the sneaky way he was transferred from the reformatory to the State School and spent seven years beyond his original sentence. Fixing a steady gaze on me he said, "I figure the state owes me those seven years."

Truthfully, Ernest said, there had been many times when he was strongly tempted to steal money. Once when he was working for a wrecking company in Majorport and the owner was out in back, Ernest had thought how easy it would be to pick up a bunch of $20 bills and walk out. (He was questioned but released on a charge of larceny in 1960.)

Ernest's restlessness and dissatisfaction with his numerous jobs were verified by him and described in an earlier interview. He can give logical reasons for the unfair treatment he has received from various employers and undoubtedly, in some instances, he has been treated shabbily but this has happened too many times to be entirely believable. Society still owes him, I think, and Ernest is still trying to collect. At times when he talked of being too sick to report to work, it was rather easy to get him to admit this was only an excuse.

Ernest had one real chance to advance himself under the Manpower Retraining Program. The course would, in total, have lasted about a year and he could have become a mechanic, a job which he claims genuinely interested him, but the way the course was conducted irritated him and he quit after eight weeks. There were maybe fifteen guys taking this course and too much of the time their one instructor would absent himself for one reason or another and leave them to their own devices for sometimes two hours at a time. That this program may as yet be disorganized is entirely believable but again there is no mistaking the fact that Ernest cannot find the patience, the peace within himself or enough self-discipline to organize his own life because he is being chased by some pretty frightening demons.

He tried to explain this to me. He said he lived alone lots of the time, but at night when he thinks about events of his childhood or his own later problems, he just has to get out with people and talk or keep busy some way to blot out his own frightening thoughts or mental pictures.

Going the way of the bottle is not the solution, says Ernest, because even though you may stay drunk for a day, a week or longer, there comes a time when you are again sober and the same old problems are there to face. His current belief in the 'clean slate' will undoubtedly not serve its purpose for long either, for Ernest is intelligent and knows that you don't get something for nothing. He makes the usual resolutions - staying on the job, keeping straight, etc. - but he still seems overruled by persistent emotional crises which keep him in flight.

I was not sure why Ernest had come to Majorport on a weekday. He offered the excuse that he wanted to pay some bills in town and in person to show his good faith. Whether this was again some expurgation of his emotions or whether he has gotten into trouble, I could not tell. He looked a bit startled when he denied being in any trouble.

Ernest is currently living with Diane Lathrop's husband in Norwich, Conn. (the Lathrops were divorced, remarried, and are currently in the process of divorce again). Mrs. Lathrop left her husband after the family had moved to Connecticut several years ago. There appears to be infidelity on both sides. Ernest seems quite impartial and likes both of them. Apparently Bill Lathrop was rather startled when Ernest arrived on his doorstep five months ago but in just two-three days he had gotten Ernest a job at the same plant where he is employed - a paper company in a near-by community. Ernest is a general laborer but gets a fairly good salary - $75 net - when he works a full week which may not be often. The two share expenses, Ernest said.

It was interesting that in describing a weekly bowling ritual with Bill and friends, it disturbed Ernest that the bartender at an adjoining Pub set out the beer pitcher and glasses as soon as he saw the boys coming through the door. Ernest seemed to feel that they might be getting the reputation of being chronic drunks!

Ernest is friendly with the various Majorport ex-pts. and he and his pal, Roger Frizzell, have lived with several of them at times - Clyde Marsh and Sandy Forrest particularly. I found it interesting that Ernest could so readily understand his vulnerability to a fellow like Sandy who has to have his pound of flesh from time to time. Ernest quite voluntarily provided this insight along with a description of Sandy as a "sneak." It seems that Sandy had "sold" Ernest a car for $25, took a deposit of $15 from Ernest, and then sold the car to someone else for the full price. Since Ernest had thoughtfully registered the car, Sandy had also used the plates for his own car. Ernest says he has done nothing about it but if Sandy has an accident then he is in for real trouble. These two are, as a consequence, on the outs at present, although this may be only temporary. Ernest, on the whole, seems to be readily accepted by other former patients. He says his closest friend is Clyde Marsh. Ernest was interested in who I thought was the most successful of all the dischargees, and his own vote went to Clyde Marsh because of his steady qualities. Ernest (who also stutters when he is nervous) observed that Clyde was awfully nervous but tried to cover it up and did pretty well at it.

Ernest was supposedly heading back to Conn. on Sunday night. I did get from him, however, that he had been scanning the want ads of the Majorport paper but hadn't seen anything. Sooner or later he will probably return to Majorport.

***

BILL DELLENBAUGH

Born 1932. Admitted in 1950 at age 17. Trial visits beginning in 1954, with discharge in 1959 at age 27. A 1950 Stanford Binet placed the IQ at 48. A 1957 WAIS had scores of Verbal 63, Performance 71, Full Scale 64. HTP, Porteus, etc., in a related battery gave an IQ range of 73 - 88.

Neglected and abused by marginal, unstable, and rejecting parents, Bill passed at age 3 to Health and Welfare custody. He was the youngest of the sibling group. The number of foster homes he lived in from that age until 16 is uncertain, but certainly it was several. Between 1949 and

1950 he was in seven. Regarding all these foster homes, Bill said in reply to a question on a taped interview, "Well, no, they didn't show me any affection or love as far as that goes. Actually, I didn't want 'em to - I didn't want to get too well attached to a private family. I felt like I probably wouldn't always be there - they'd probably transfer me around to different places there -- somebody might get sick or something.... You never know what's going to happen in life...."

At PHTC, Bill's emotional stability seemed poor, and a number of trial visit placements terminated because of interpersonal problems, dissatisfaction, and maladjustment. After discharge, Bill circulated with the Morganton "group" of dischargees, similar to the one in Majorport, and most of the persons noted in the interview account that follows are also dischargees:

After some hunting I found the Dellenbaugh apartment on the 3rd floor of an orange apartment house. Inside there are two rooms and bath. There were various furnishings and appliances of good quality.

When I reached the apartment, Norm Lemay (also a dischargee) opened the door. Bill was sitting in the kitchen in disheveled appearance. Despite this untidiness, his appearance was striking. He is a brown-haired, brown-eyed man in his early thirties and quite handsome. He has a very slow manner, whether speaking or moving. My first impression was laziness. Later, however it seemed to be more than this. Bill said that wife, Betty, was at a Christmas party at Libbys' Nursing Home.

Bill and Betty were married in 1960. They have no children. The marriage has been a stormy one -- Betty left him once in 1963.

Immediately following discharge Bill lived with his sister, Caroline, in Dublin. When the two could no longer get along, he left. He then went to work at Portugal Springs House (in the kitchen). From there he went to Weymouth, then spent a short time in Majorport. When he married, he was living in Chester and working for Riverhead Poultry. He stayed with Riverhead for 2½ years... At that time he was fired (oversleeping, arguments, etc.).

Bill then took a job with a construction crew. Later, he returned to Riverhead again; was fired (for oversleeping, spring of 1964). In the summer of 1964, he worked on Rt. 95 for sometime although he frequently skipped work... "when he was not feeling well." He then went to work at Perfection Plastics in Chester (roofing crew). The job was finished in late Oct. - early Nov. He is now working for a contracting company building some chicken coops for Riverhead Poultry.

Bill said he felt badly about having "messed himself up with Riverhead", as he liked it there. Later, however, he complained that his fingers got infected. Bill had numerous complaints about unfair employers, poor wages, poor health, etc. It would seem that he has a great deal of difficulty getting along with people over long periods of time.

Bill sleeps a greater part of the time. It is difficult to wake him up, he said. Much of the time he has no energy, and the slightest task is difficult for him. He said he had been to many doctors but has not found "one that knows anything." One, Dr. Howard of Morganton, told him he had poor circulation. One doctor gave him pep pills and they made him "sleepy." Bill said that there are times when he has "a great deal of energy and feels wonderful."

His sleeping the days through has caused him to lose several jobs. Bill said he feels he is unable to control the situation, i.e., he can't keep from sleeping even if there is something he wants to do badly.

Bill also stated he has a violent temper and finds this hard to control, although he is slow to anger and these temper flare-ups are not too frequent.

He seemed to have mixed emotions re Betty. She picks at him, he said. Bill said she has lots of reasons. In '63 she became angry when he was fired from Riverhead, and left him. He said that he hated to get a new rent and have her run off and leave him. This depresses him often, he said -- the thought of Betty leaving -- yet sometimes he wishes he never married.

Bill said he became violently angry last summer when Betty and Anita Nadeau went off to work at Glebe Mountain. He felt that if his wife cared for him at all, she would stay home.

Bill claims it is difficult to make Betty understand things -- money, etc.... noted her retardation here. She also feels that she is right all of the time, he said.

Bill makes $60 a week on his present job. Betty makes $22 on hers. He has a loan of $300 from HFC which he is paying on. Bill has a car, license, but no insurance. The Dellenbaughs pay $10/week rent. Norm Lemay is a close friend, and Norm seems to advise him and keep him out of trouble to some degree. Norm is trying to get Bill to go to work, buy insurance, and not borrow from loan companies. Norm, however, is off to Rangifer and his parents next Saturday having finally found a job up that way.

Bill said that he and his wife once won a trip to Florida from Morganton Massage or some such place. He showed pictures - of a Bill Dellenbaugh who looked happier and healthier - wife then also looked attractive and happy. Couple flew by jet, loved it, although Bill said he was glad to get home as his wife was "driving him crazy."

Bill complained of aches and pains and constantly babied and talked of a cut finger. He said he could not read and was quite sensitive about being "dumb." He also apologized repeatedly "for looking like a bum." One had the feeling that he was afraid he was a bum. Bill said his nerves are bad, especially "when he gets thinking about things... about what a bum he is."

He is not particularly sensitive about being at PSS... associates solely with ex-pts. and seems to be titular leader of the Morganton-Chester crowd. He noted that William Boynton now is married to "an outsider." The two had news of other PHTC's; Wilfred Bennet owes $1,000 to HFC; Dennis Rourke is drinking heavily although they believe that he is not fooling around with Madeleine's children. Madeleine is presently living with Herbert Watson, and the two plan to be married in January. Madeleine, both said, is now avoided as much as possible as he is "always in a mess." Gerald Agostino worked for the shoe shop until he was fired two weeks ago. According to Bill and Norman, he did not lose his car to wife #1 as present car is "the only one he ever had." He is supposed to pay wife #1 $15/wk. alimony and has not done so for a month. Henry Taylor has moved out, his bank roll completely depleted. Roger Frizzell has moved in and is now supporting Agostino family operations. Gerald still has only his driver's permit and is driving around solo. While I was there Dennis Rourke called asking that the boys bring over a bottle (booze).

Bill seems to be more handicapped by emotional problems than mental ones. Is this "nervous" business part of a family syndrome?? One wonders, too, about the constant drowsiness -- all emotional or are there some organic problems, too?

***

Where there seems to be a clear potential for higher performance, factors other than the previously cited centrifugal forces may be at work hindering such performance. In the two following cases, an egregious lack of any integrating principle in the first, rather than anything more forceful, seems to be the causal factor. In the second case, physical disability seems to be the main hindering factor. In relation to the great majority of dischargees, each of these cases in its own way must be regarded as an extreme of less fortunate adjustment.

CEDRIC BEACH

> Born 1916. Admitted in 1931 at age 15. Trial visit in 1953, with discharge in 1954 at age 38. A Revised Binet in 1931 gave an IQ score of 51. In 1942 the Binet score was 81, and a 1952 WB Full Scale IQ score was 106. Patient was discharged as "Normal."
>
> By the time Cedric was 3, his father had departed or deserted, and his mother had remarried. Four years later, the stepfather followed the same exit route. Cedric seems to have been in one or more foster homes when he was between 10 and 14 years old. Mother, father, and stepfather all seem to have been extremely inadequate persons. At PSS, Cedric achieved a 7th Grade education, and conducted a voluminous correspondence with a number of persons (cousins, stamp collectors, matchbook collectors, etc.) in a writing style that suggested both elegance and confusion, and in handwriting that suggested some kind of brain injury. The interviewer's account follows:

I visited Cedric Beach at the County Jail, in Cardiff, where he is now incarcerated for driving while his license was suspended. Cedric was dressed in jail garb, fortyish, and badly in need of a haircut. He was warm and friendly.

Cedric described himself as a Jack-of-all-trades. He has roamed the country from Maine to Florida, held about forty different jobs. He is fond of taking correspondence courses and going to night school. He has worked in factories, and as a mechanic, plumber, janitor, electrician, carpenter, logger, salesman, waiter, dishwasher, and cook - to name a few.

Cedric's exact moves since discharge are difficult to pinpoint as he moved hither and thither. He was in Silverland for four years, and worked for a construction company in Dublin. He was married in 1956, to a Cardiff girl. This girl was poorly educated and quite unfaithful. They had three children, 2 girls and a boy. One girl and boy were killed in an auto accident in about 1961 or 1962 -- Cedric driving. It was found that he was driving without liability at the time, and his license was suspended for three years. (Hence, the reason for his present incarceration.) The Judge at Cardiff advised him to refuse the fine and stay in jail. Thus, he would leave with his insurance paid.

Cedric has one daughter, born with a club foot, who lives with a foster family in Snowport. The foot was operated on in Boston and is now perfectly normal. Cedric visits the child often, but feels he could not bring up the child properly. He fought for the child as he felt that she should not remain with her mother.

In 1962, it was discovered that Cedric had a touch of TB and spent six months at the State Sanitorium. He is presently under medication but has had no health problems.

Following discharge from the above, he worked as a bell-hop and a waiter in Bondbridge, Massachusetts (Old Coach Inn). He worked here for the full season and then returned to the Cardiff area. He had been in Cardiff two weeks before he was arrested. His future plans are to live with friends in Cardiff until the season opens again in Bondbridge.

Cedric is a man of average or better intelligence. The sheriff informed me that a recent WAIS indicated an IQ of 125; the last PHTC IQ was 106. Cedric did well in a course in accounting but never pursued this as he likes "to work with his hands and likes working with people better." The sheriff further stated that Cedric has never been fired from a job and this is on record. Most of the jobs have run out. He also said that Cedric's estimate of 40 different jobs matched their record or somebody's record.

Cedric's outside interests are varied. He is an avid chess player, reads books on this. He is also an astrology bug, carves things out of wood -- Cedric is a movie goer and a magazine reader, loves sports, paints in watercolors and oils, collects stamps, matchbook covers; he is an amateur photographer, plays poker, bridge, and canasta, reads novels and medical journals. This man is disorganized and is not committed to any one thing but to a stream of generalities. He has superficial knowledge of many things and is what the world would call a dilettante. He moves frequently because he likes to experience many things, jobs, and different kinds of people. He also claims to be psychic and predicts many events with or without the aid of astrology.

He appears to be a man who has never cared enough for any one thing to stick to it, becomes easily bored and undoubtedly has never found what he really wanted. It may be because he has refused to say "no" to himself, refused to cut off any interest, and this refusal has resulted in too many interests, too little time, and complete disorganization.

***

LEON LATHAM

Born 1907. Admitted in 1920 at age 12. Trial visits began in 1956, with discharge in 1959 at age 52. A 1924 Revised Binet gave an IQ of 60. In 1953, scores on a WB were Verbal 72, Performance 84, Full Scale 77. Epileptiform (petit mal ?) seizures occurred at times.

The childhood background is quite obscure, the parents being reportedly quite marginal. Leon had apparently lived in at least two foster homes before coming to PSS. In his earlier years here, he seemed starved for parent or parent-surrogate contacts, and once escaped to visit a nearby "Aunty and Uncle" who had once cared for him, but who like the rest of his relatives never came to visit him. In later years he turned into a puttery, thoroughly institutionalized soul who went through a lengthy series of short trial visits before being discharged. The interviewer's account follows:

Mr. Latham is an aging, somewhat childlike person. My visit was an important event to him, he stated, as he had been waiting for my letter since he had heard about the interviews from Bill Dellenbaugh in November.

Mr. Latham's life since discharge has been filled with employment troubles. Up until 1962, he held full-time jobs, but since that time has had nothing but part-time work. He has found life in the world somewhat confusing.

His first job was at Peterson Construction. His second at the Pilgrim Restaurant, dishwashing, and the third at Sawyer the Florist. The last job he left when he had a hernia in 1962. He now works part-time at the Pilgrim, and in the past did part-time work for Riverhead Poultry (had seizures and had to stop) and the Nassau Motel.

Almost immediately upon discharge, Leon lodged himself in an apartment only to find that the landlord would not wait until his first pay check. Out on the street and somewhat bewildered, he took himself to the Commerce Hotel and remained there for quite sometime. He then stayed with Wilfred Bennett for a week -- at which time Wilfred demanded $10 which Leon was unable to pay (or did not feel he should). After floundering from apartment to apartment, he met Mrs. Lessard, a widow, and employer of PHTC patients. Leon is thankful for this, and as he said, "She is the first person who ever cared what happened to me." Mrs. Lessard, a gruff but kindly lady in her sixties, is thankful that she found Mr. Latham. Leon does odd jobs around the house for which he gets room and board. In addition, Mrs. Lessard said Leon gives her money to buy something for one of her daughters or herself -- which she otherwise could not afford.

Leon is convulsive, and although these episodes are regulated by medicine, they do occur several times a year. This further handicaps him regarding employment, and Mrs. Lessard said that employers are hesitant about him for this reason. Leon has been hit by a car several times when these have taken place.

Leon spent three weeks in the hospital when operated on for a hernia, and one week when his leg was injured in an auto accident. He has borrowed money to pay hospital and doctor bills; yet, still owes the hospital $100. At one time he had Blue Cross - Blue Shield, but has found this unsatisfactory as his bills were still huge. He is unable to get A.D. or City Welfare as he is not completely disabled.

Leon is a somewhat discouraged man who would like to be self-supporting but cannot. His compentency with money can be questionned, said Mrs. Lessard, as he is generous to excess. Recently he bailed Bill Dellenbaugh out of debt at the Pilgrim Restaurant - not because he approves of Bill, but because he does not like to see people get into trouble, and feels Bill has a great deal of trouble anyway, considering "he won't work."

Mr. Latham has learned two things which are very important to him, since leaving PHTC -- to ride a bicycle and to play the piano (by ear). This latter skill he domonstrated, and it is clearly there, although he may have memorized this rather than picked it out by ear. Leon says he would like a job as a music teacher but has been afraid to apply for one. Instead he applies for janitor and dishwasher work. There is some indication here that Mr. Latham's aspirations are greater than his capabilities.

He is a man who has not been successful employmentwise, and post-discharge has been an endless succession of job failures -- usually due to poor health, his seizures, or mental incapability. About the only success Leon has is his relationship with the Lessard family.

He said that he has not seen his relatives since he was admitted in 1920, except that he was taken to see his mother on her deathbed, and there he met a half-sister. He sought out this half-sister after discharge, but she was reluctant to see him. He calls her on Christmas, but she has only consented to entertain him twice in her home, and even at these times quite unwillingly.

Leon belongs to St. Anthony's Church in Morganton and seems to get some satisfaction and guide to daily living from this experience.

He circulates socially with the Dellenbaugh-Bennett-Rourke Corps. of the Morganton PHTC crowd, but this group does not seem to do much but offer floundering persons, bobbing events, and little certainty about the future. For Leon these people seem to be familiar parts of the past, and there is a sort of bungled utilitarian way of caring about others who were at PHTC. But they in no way are capable of restoring a parent relationship such as Leon has with Mrs. Lessard.

His greatest dream, says Leon, is to come back to PHTC as a music teacher -- talk here on the value of music. Leon also plays the accordion, harmonica, etc. Perhaps this expresses an even greater desire to return to PHTC where the future is certain and where the struggle for survival is not as great. Although a satisfactory relationship with Mrs. Lessard has been established, a time will come when she will be dead and there will be nothing but the endless employment search. Leon appears to be too old, too institutionalized, and too handicapped (e.g., seizures) to hold full-time employment or adjust properly to a world so foreign to him.

***

Lengthy institutionalization -- and particularly the institutional experience of a past era -- has been an ingredient in a number of cases already presented. Because of the presence of other, compounding elements, it has been somewhat difficult to isolate the actual effects of institutionalization in their more extreme forms. The following case illustrates what institutionalization of a past era has done to a normal child.

HOWARD WINFIELD

Born 1924. Admitted in 1930 at age 6. Trial visits began in 1955, with discharge in 1958 at age 34. IQ on admission in 1930, on a Revised Binet was 97 (ninety-seven). A 1958 WAIS yielded IQ scores of Verbal 70, Performance 84, Full Scale 74.

When Howard was 4, his apparently quite responsible father died. Howard's mother suffered some kind of psychotic reaction with acting-out sexual behavior that earned her a sentence at Women's Reformatory. Howard and siblings passed into State custody and a foster home. The then equivalent of H&W schemed to unload Howard and a brother who was actually quite retarded onto Pownal State School. A Mr. Grube B. Cornish "testified" that Howard could not "write, add, count, or multiply" and was "considered mentally deficient."

On admission to PSS however, Howard was found able to count, could repeat 5 digits, etc., and scored 97 on an academically oriented Revised Binet. The admitting physician, a Dr. Carey, commented, "A bright little chap of some six years of age. Upon observation it cannot but make one wonder why he is classified as feeble minded." He added hopefully, "Should be carefully observed in order to determine whether or not he is properly placed in this institution. At present it seems as if he were not."

In those days a patient spent his time in an overcrowded, locked day room or in "school"; what education was offered was in an overcrowded, ungraded, poorly staffed basement room with half-day attendance. In the course of remarrying three times, Howard's mother was almost completely indifferent to his condition and fate, and visited the school only once. Howard turned in on himself, his brief school progress stopped, and he simple "gave up". By the time he was 19, his mental age was still at the same level it had been on admission, and the IQ had accordingly dropped to 44 (forty-four).

For a number of years he was lost in the institutional crowd. In 1954, retesting on a WB gave a Full Scale score of only 56, but higher Performance. Trial visits followed, and with them an eventual advance to a WAIS Full Scale score of 74. The psychologist commented in 1954 on Howard's apparently higher intelligence, on his timidity, his great constriction in dealing with other people, his lack of rapport with other adults, and the fact that Howard recognized only capital letters and could not make change for a dime.

In a way, through trial visits and discharge, something was salvaged -- but the interviewer's account that follows reveals what this past type of lengthy institutional treatment did to a "bright little chap of some six years of age."

I located Howard while he was on his lunch hour at Sawyer the Florist. A short man (5 ft.), Howard was slightly bald but rather nice looking. He was very friendly, but the whole idea of my presence seemed somewhat baffling to him. Howard stuttered profusely and at times showed difficulty comprehending my questions. He was very quiet and seemed to be far away.

Howard has been working at the Greenhouse at Sawyer's for 5 years now. Prior to that, he worked at Roberge's farm and a couple of other farms. Howard said he enjoyed the work at Sawyer's and talked about some aspects of his work.

Howard lives at the Mandarin Hotel in Morganton. He sees some other dischargees, goes to movies, collects stamps, but otherwise leads a very quiet life. Occasionally he sees a brother.

He does not drive and felt he wouldn't be able to learn. He has a great deal of difficulty reading and cannot write.

Howard found everything very confusing when he was discharged. He said he had difficulty getting a job and remarked how confusing "all those forms were."

Howard seems more withdrawn than mentally handicapped. The world and his environment seems to be quite foreign to him. Howard appears to have a well constructed shell which prevents him from living in society as others. There are no strong ties to act as a bridge between himself and the environment; as a result, excepting his work and occasional pleasures, he lives entirely within himself.

Admitted to PSS as normal, he was probably forced to withdraw. This withdrawal, I think, accounts for the downward trend to his IQ, poor speech, and education (reading and writing). With no traumatic incidents in the future, he will probably remain the same for the rest of his life - a hermit in society.

***

A number of our dischargees have attained an "ideal" level of performance that combines economic independence with a mature and cooperative social self-sufficiency that one might expect to find in responsible members of society at large. This section describes a few of them.

Obviously, not all dischargees can function at this level. For many, the inherent limitation of greater retardation is a major deterring factor; serious emotional and psychological difficulties, and the effects of past custodial institutionalization make for other limitations.

It has been said that while there are many stories to be written about families with problems, there is only one story to be written about happy families. Similarly, with the dischargees successfully adjusted at this advanced level, less illustration than in previous pages is required. The pattern is a familiar one, and not fraught with social or pathological variation.

Creating some of the variation that does occur is the division between the married and the single, with some of the latter appearing en route to marriage. Age differences, reflecting the length of institutionalization, provide other lines of division, with the younger dischargees following a more familiar and normal pattern of success usually at a modest economic level. Older dischargees often face more special problems of adapting to a world that is to them new and unfamiliar, and have the handicap of personalities influenced by the lengthy and despotic institutionalization of a past era.

Individual differences do occur in the degree and quality of success. At the upper end of the scale, there were a very few spectacular examples of rather middle class performance, but these have been omitted as being less representative illustrations of the general upper level of our dischargee population, less to be expected, and probably less believable.

When a dischargee marries a non-dischargee spouse, the former is often the silent and non-participating partner of the latter, who alone deals easily and from long experience with the everyday and unusual problems of life in the community.

Inter-dischargee or "endogamous" marriages constitute only a minority of all discharge marriages, but they are of considerable interest because both partners not only share a common experience but also must face together common problems directly. Such marriages therefore serve to delineate these problems more clearly.

Three such endogamous marriages are described, with backgrounds of prior institutionalization ranging from longer to briefer. While a degree of independence is noted in all three, there are mentors or parent-like advisory figures in the background of the first two cases, and it is only the third and youngest couple that, after a considerable struggle, seems to be most fully independent.

RICHARD WALKER
THERESA (REDDING) WALKER

Richard Walker was born in 1907. Admitted in 1919 at age 12, trial visits in 1954, and discharge in 1955 at age 48. IQ on entry in 1920 was 83 (eighty-three) on a Revised Binet. A 1952 WB yielded scores of Verbal 94, Performance 108, Full Scale 100. The background on this case is one of the most obscure. Richard came to PSS from an orphanage, and his placement here was apparently without justification. Illegitimacy and assiduous concealment are not impossible, with Richard as victim. On discharge, after 35 years of institutional life, he wrote, "It seems as though I am coming out of a dream and left it way behind."

Theresa Redding was born in 1921. Admitted in 1940 at age 19, trial visits in 1955, with discharge in 1958 at age 37. IQ on entry gave a Binet score of 69. A 1958 WB gave IQ scores of Verbal 91, Performance 72, Full Scale 82. There were probable convulsive disorders from infancy to about age 10. When Theresa was 16, her mother died, and her father expected her to take over the care of a number of younger siblings at that time. She took to roaming the streets and going with "a low class of men." After a brief stay at the Chester City Farm, she was sent to PSS. The reaction to the interview visit (and a most unthreatening interviewer) is not untypical of those who had endured earlier institutionalization:

> These two set up a definite appointment in the reply sent. The Walker home is located not too far from the downtown section of Dirigo but in a residential district. The area is a mixture of middle class and lower class homes. A block away are homes that one would place in upper-middle class. The light was burning on the porch as I ascended the thirty-odd steps leading to the house. The door was in somewhat battered condition with glass patched up with masking tape....no bell. The lady of the house came running (literally) to my knock. She was extremely nervous and hastily ushered me in - with some rather terrified chatter. She was a small woman with frizzled hair and later impressed me as a kind of time-worn Holly-Golightly. In the kitchen I met Mr. Walker - very calm by contrast, and friend Johnny, a round-faced jolly sort. Mr. Walker looked older than he was -- was balding with snow white hair. This was due to the fact that he had had both typhoid and scarlet fever at PHTC.
>
> The house was very clean but in poor condition - paint chips, creaky floors, and everything seemed to tilt. The furnishings were modest but in good condition.
>
> Mrs. Walker (Theresa) continued to be extremely frightened and agitated during the questions. It came out later that she had been upset and sleepless since receiving the letter. She had set a definite date so that she wouldn't have to wait any longer. Both Hubby and Johnny had attempted to calm her about this visit. She was worried that she would not "pass the test" and be taken back to PHTC. She stated that she had been there for some twenty years and did not ever want to go back. I assured her that there was no test and there was no possibility of her going back. It was not until I repeated this some ten times that she seemed at ease. This visit, she added, had also brought back some unpleasant memories from the past.
>
> Johnny stated that he was a friend and also boss of the husband at the Poultry Plant. He had befriended these people when they moved in and from time to time acted as kind of adviser to them. The Walkers both said that they probably would not have done so well if they had not had Johnny to turn to. The Walkers and Johnny and wife often go out socially and travel to Morganton, Boston, Rostock for football games. Johnny said that he has visited Pineland as an inspector for the VFW and was very interested in the place. He mentioned a friend, who he said worked in the finance office. He said that until very recently awful things had gone on out there and he and his group had worked hard to get improvements.
>
> Theresa still has speech problems and stuttered frequently during the beginning of the interview, but this subsided when she relaxed. Both had done pretty well, they said, since they had left Pineland. Their marriage seems to have been a very happy one and both seemed very thankful that they had each

other. The only real difficulty they had had was a stillbirth which Theresa had had some time ago. This left her quite ill and it had been necessary for Mr. Walker to sell his car and dig into his savings to pay her medical expenses. Mr. Walker stated that the only other really sad thing that had happened to him was one time when he was a grave digger he dug a grave for a man named Carey and found after he finished it was Dr. Carey from PHTC who had befriended him many times. Both Mr. and Mrs. Walker seem at least of normal intelligence. Mr. Walker had changed jobs often in the past, mostly because the jobs "kept running out." His present job at the Poultry Plant has been his for over five years and Johnny stated that he was one of the best workers he had.

Both Theresa and her husband stated that the outside world was rather strange to them after being at PHTC so long. There were many adjustments to make and both were thankful of the help that Johnny and his wife had given them. They felt that more dischargees would be successful if they had someone to turn to when in need of advice.

Mr. Walker had been at PHTC for over thirty years. He had been there when Dr. Hawkes was the head and said that things were so bad then I wouldn't believe it. He said that he had talked to Dr. Hawkes a couple of times and on one occasion the latter had told him... "You'll never get out of here alive." Mr. Walker said he replied that he would, too, and felt that his constant hope and stubbornness enabled him to get out, though many years later. Conditions in the buildings were rather unsanitary, he said, and there were sometimes as many as fifty in a room. They were often locked in and poorly fed. Both Mr. and Mrs. said that having no freedom at all when in PHTC made it harder for them when they got out. Yes, there was a lot of mistreatment, deaths that should not have been, etc. No specifics offered here. Both were very interested in the changes that have taken place and expressed a desire to drive around and see the new buildings. Both asked about J. Goodwin, Mrs. Drake, Mrs. Norris, and "Nappy"... they mentioned that they try to eat in Nappy's father's restaurant once a year. Both felt that despite all the harsh treatment they learned things at the school. They expressed affection for Dr. Bowman and hoped that they would get to talk with him someday soon.

Theresa takes care of children a few blocks away all day. She loves this work and says it is the nearest thing to having children of her own. She also cares dutifully for three kittens. She loves crossword puzzles and does the Trib's. She was very excited that I did them, too, and compared answers to last week's puzzle. Theresa seems very easily upset and quite sensitive. Says when she is upset or hurt hubby explains things to her and she immediately feels better. They don't hang around with the PHTC crowd as they have their own friends, and the crowd seems to run with rather undesirable people. Theresa says she counts her blessings and husband agrees, for while they do not have much they have each other, and they are both well and "that is all that counts." Memories of PHTC are not all trauma - both remember many people fondly and Mrs. asked me about some of the "poor unfortunates" she had cared for.

Hubby reads lots of books, magazines like Popular Mechanics and Science. He has decided opinions, he says, and Mrs. says that he can be "stubborn as a mule." Mr. tinkers with old radios and short wave equipment. Says he loves to take things apart and put them together again. Both very fond of JFK - pictures all over the house. Mr. likes the ballgames and westerns on TV while Theresa is fond of Doc Kildare and Casey and also some soap operas. These people seemed very sincere and happy. Although Mrs. was terrified by my visit she was not interested in impressing me. She simply stated that they did not have much, but they had kept out of trouble, made friends, and were very happy.

Theresa's nervousness has made adjustment difficult for her but her marriage seems to have eased this a great deal. These two seemed to have made an excellent adjustment.

***

DENNIS HALL
ANITA (NADEAU) HALL

Dennis Hall was born in 1919. Admitted in 1933 at age 13, and discharged in 1953 at age 34. Somewhat before and up to time of discharge he was at a TB sanatorium. Revised Binet IQ in 1933 was 72. A 1952 WB gave IQ scores of Verbal 92, Performance 97, Full Scale 94. At some point during his first ten years, his mother died and Dennis was placed in a foster home. The family background is unclear. A town charge, Dennis was eventually shipped to PSS. From about 1935 on, a "mild" case of tuberculosis, usually quiescent, was a medical problem.

Anita Nadeau was born in 1921. Admitted in 1938 at age 17, trial visits began in 1954, with discharge in 1959 at age 38. A Revised Binet IQ in 1938 was 56. A WB in 1952 gave scores of Verbal 69, Performance 61, Full Scale 63. Sometime during Anita's early childhood, her father deserted. The mother is described as "immoral" and had but little interest in her daughter. By age 10, Anita was in custody of the Bureau of Social Welfare, and by age 14 had been in several foster homes. After a few more such shifts, she was sent to PSS. A pleasant personality enabled her to socialize comfortably with most people, but her judgement in money matters was thought to be poor.

Two accounts are given. One is of Dennis Hall, at the time he and Henry Taylor were visited. Shortly after that, Dennis and Anita Nadeau were married. The second account, about two years later, follows up this marriage.

Account No. 1:

Dennis was interviewed simultaneously with Henry Taylor at their mutually shared apartment. Dennis is somewhat naive (at least in comparison with Henry, who acts somewhat as interpreter and certainly as spokesman for this pair), but no more naive than any number of gainfully employed persons long at large in society.

Formerly Prostestant, Dennis has more recently turned Catholic, because of his coming marriage with ex-patient, Anita Nadeau. They plan, says Dennis, to live in a rooming house or the like that his bride-to-be has lived in, in the past; the landlord has said that there would be space available for them.

Dennis is certainly a harmless soul, at least on first impression; Henry apparently somewhat feels that he must "look out" for Dennis, in a semi-protective arrangement, and seems to have taken him under his wing, so to speak.

Dennis has had a somewhat more varied career than Henry. He was in the TB Sanatorium where he had a rather severe operation to remove several ribs and close off an infected lung, or remove it. This apparently was during a return to the Sanatorium following discharge. (He had had the TB condition earlier while at PSS, and it had apparently been arrested.) Then he worked in a restaurant in Majorport, but ran into trouble because of the TB. At some time he was working for a cousin, doing logging, and the like. This cousin is apparently a rather calloused fellow; when Dennis was payed or was about to be payed for his work, his cousin took out a portion of green bills for himself from the pile of money, saying that he guessed Dennis should pay for the X-mas present that he, the cousin, had given to him. At a later time, when Dennis was hospitalized for appendix, the cousin had come for a single visit; Dennis had asked that others in this family might come to see him, and the cousin had said he "guessed he wouldn't waste the gas on it," re auto transportation; after he left, MD's and nurses expressed astonishment at this statement, asked Dennis who this person was. Dennis replied, ruefully, that it was his cousin.

Dennis's father died not long ago, and Dennis was the only one to turn up for the funeral; all the rest of the family were unwilling or unable to come to it. The minister waited a while, and then they had the services; Dennis had this Episcopal, since that was his father's religion.

Apparently following Sanatorium treatment, Dennis went to Florida to work for a winter, with a friend, but found this work (kitchen and related) too tiring, as it sometimes ran for twenty hours at a stretch. Following this winter, he returned to Maine, where for five years of transhumance he worked in kitchen department of Reynolds College in the winter, and for rural Seabury Lodge in the summers. He liked the people at the latter place very much; at one point there was an epidemic of intestinal flu, and Dennis experienced a good deal of abdominal difficulty and then acute pain within a week or so after that time. This was ascribed to the flu, but a visit to a local MD suggested appendix. He was rushed to Morganton Hospital, and appendix ruptured on X-ray table (X-ray technician having pommeled him in an exploratory fashion in inquire where the pain was, etc., doubting it was appendix). However, the operation was immediately after, and in time.

For the last two years, Dennis has worked at Municipal Hospital, also in the housekeeping department. He finds that the costs of getting to and from Seabury Lodge in summers outweighed the $$ benefits, and now has settled down to this year-round pattern (perhaps due to advice of Henry Taylor?). He grosses $40/week. Dennis gives at least a partial impression of being a somewhat gullible person whom others might be able, because of his pleasant nature, to take financial advantage of. He is much more down-east than Henry.

Henry, in the above context re relatives, says that often relatives would be disinterested in a patient at PSS, but as soon as they discovered that he is out and making money and has saved some money, then they become very interested and attentive -- until they get the cash they are able to from him.

Dennis's THP is $33.78/week. He also has Blue Cross - Blue Shield; Keystone State Ins.; he is unable to get any kind of retirement insurance, because of the history of TB that he has had. Both Dennis and Henry work rather similar hours. No meal benefits; these must be purchased at the hospital.

In the Seabury Lodge area, Dennis had been some kind of a deacon or the like in a Protestant church. At the present time, he is, having switched to Catholic, a committeeman of St. Anthony's Boy Scout group.

As it may have been a controversial subject, Dennis' coming marriage, although mentioned by me favorably, did not seem to get much commented on by Dennis or Henry, and perhaps has been an item of contention.

Account No. 2 - about 2 years later:

The Hall apartment is located next door to St. Anthony's School in Morganton. The building is freshly painted and in good condition. It also is the base of St. Anthony's Credit Union.

The Hall apartment is on the second floor. There are four good-sized rooms; the rooms are nicely furnished. The Halls have various religious objects on display and framed pictures of JFK. A hi-fi was visible as was a TV set and an abundant supply of books from "Profiles in Courage" to "Adam Bede."

Anita met me at the door, was extremely polite and gracious and apologized for the state of her apartment (which was orderly and immaculate). We talked briefly while she showed me the painting she had been doing and also their wedding pictures (which were on display in the living room).

The Halls appear to be living comfortably. Dennis earns about $55/week as a janitor at St. Anthony's School. Anita worked this summer at a camp at Glebe Mountain, and for a time, at Portugal Springs as a chambermaid. She is presently looking for work, either as a chambermaid or mother's helper. Both have Prudential Life Ins. and also Hospitalization.

After discharge, Anita was working at a convent in Morganton. She left there to go to Canada with her sister who proceeded to bleed her dry of money. She then returned to Morganton to work, and in 1962, married Dennis. Throughout the years, she has had the advice of Father Flaherty of St. Brendan's in Morganton (now in Majorport) and priests at St. Anthony's. Priests at St. Anthony's seem to have taken this couple under their wing and helped them on to new progress. From time to time, they give advice; send people up who need babysitters, etc. In return both the Halls do a great deal of work sans pay. Dennis is a Boy Scout troop assistant, and Anita does work with various ladies' societies - Queen's Guild, for one.

When Dennis arrived on time for a little brunch Anita had prepared, there was much discussion of other dischargees. They seemed to be on the lookout for people who disrupt their stability. Dennis spoke of his former roommate, Henry Taylor, who he felt had gone downhill since he had taken up with Gerald Agostino. Henry, according to Dennis, has been supporting Gerald, Laurette, and children, has made Gerald beneficiary of his insurance policy. Dennis also noted that all was not well in the Agostino household. Laurette is a poor housekeeper, refuses to care for the children, and is away from the house for long periods of time. Laurette, both said, goes barefoot to town, picks up men, and Gerald does all the housework and takes care of the children. Henry Taylor also helps out with these things. Anita and Dennis also see the Dellenbaughs "because they feel sorry for Betty." Anita said that they are careful, however, not to get mixed up with these people. Dennis said they go to bed at 9 o'clock every night and get up at 6 o'clock. They take pains that no one disturbs this daily routine. While they feel generally sorry for people having difficulty, they are aware that "you cannot take in people off the street and still have a life of your own." Anita talked at length about her sister who is an alcoholic. The sister (same one who pursuaded Anita to go to Canada) frequently asks to be taken in, etc. The Halls tried this for awhile, but found it disruptive, as the sister wanted a drinking companion, money, etc.

These two have taken pains not to have children, as they feel they are too old, and Dennis is not well.

Between the two, they have saved a considerable amount and have clear ideas of what they want.

Anita showed me around the apartment and discussed improvements they intended to make.

These two both seem normal mentally. They have good sense and appear to be doing well in the community. While the marriage brings them certain stability, I think either could function as well independently.

***

PHILLIP PETERSON
MARY (BLANCHARD) PETERSON

Phillip Peterson was born in 1939. Admitted in 1953 at age 14, with trial visits beginning in 1958, and discharge in 1961 at age 22. In 1952, Stanford Binet and WISC Full Scale both placed the IQ at 52. A 1960 WAIS gave scores of Verbal 60, Performance 74, Full Scale 64, with a "large scatter into normal range", and a psychologist's note, "Affectional & cultural deprivation have led to lowered achievement and somewhat overactive, independent behavior." The family had been marginal, Phil was a truancy problem, and was sent eventually to Boys Training Center (correctional), with transfer to Pineland, where he was boisterous, good natured, and rather conscientious in his work. The family maintained contact and interest.

Mary Blanchard was born in 1933. Admitted in 1951 at age 18, trial visits in 1957, and discharge in 1959 at age 26. A 1951 WB gave a Full Scale IQ of 57. Progressive increases resulted in a 1957 Stanford Binet IQ of 77. There seems to have been a "stepfather" on the scene when Mary was about 2. When Mary was 10, her mother died, and she was sent to a Catholic orphanage. From 15 to 18 she was in several foster homes. Socially immature at first, she later more or less "bloomed" at PHTC and on trial visits, acquiring various partisans along the way, some of whom considered her to be mentally "normal." The interviewer's account that follows describes this couple after their move to Massachusetts.

Fitch Street is located off the main artery of Merton, Massachusetts. It is a lower class neighborhood. In the rear of the yard is a large factory, and to the right a children's playground.

The Peterson apartment contains five good-sized rooms which Phil has painted himself. Mary has added feminine touches, books, and book cases.

Mary Peterson is a pretty, thirty-year-old woman. She looked a little tired and drawn. She is four months pregnant. Phil Peterson is a strong, good-looking man of twenty-six. He is very vivacious and has a lively sense of humor. Wife Mary is quiet, shy and sensitive with a pixy quality. The Petersons have two children - a boy four years old and a boy six months old. Both these children appear happy and normal. The four-year-old talks clearly and is toilet trained (and has been for some time). He is somewhat shy with strangers.

Mary Peterson worked at the Rousseau farm and at a convent in Morganton, Maine. While working in Morganton, she began seeing Phil Peterson, became pregnant and was subsequently married in a civil ceremony. Phil and Mary both described their life during this period as a nightmare of bills. There were other complications. Mary's middle-class relatives in Spednoc disowned her, and to this day they do not speak when they pass her on the street.

The couple moved in with Phil's parents in Branford, Maine. Mary stated that the day she got out of the hospital, they had zero funds, and Phil's mother took her last ten dollars and bought food, diapers, etc. They had some aid from City Welfare during this time until Phil began to work as a painter and at the local shoe shop. After Phil became employed, he felt less panicky, he said. The Rousseaus offered him twenty-two dollars a week prior to this, and Phil blew up, stating that he would not work for such a small sum.

After a year in Branford, the couple moved to Merton, Massachusetts. They lived in a three-room apartment on Chaffee Street (a block away from the present apartment) until two weeks ago. Phil worked for a year at a shoe factory in Wallace, Massachusetts, as did his wife. (He presently works for the Marshall Machine Co. from 4 PM to midnight for approximately $95/week. He also does some free-lance painting on the side for extra dollars. Mary worked at the shoe factory in Wallace until 1963, earning about $55/wk. She has recently been accepted to work for an electronics firm, but due to her pregnancy will postpone going back to work.

Mary was hospitalized in 1964 for a gall bladder operation. She also has not been feeling well with the latest pregnancy.

The Petersons are presently plagued by hospital bills but are gradually paying them off. Mary seems the more capable of the two, at least verbally. She reads a great deal. Hubby Phil can hardly read but seems to be mechanically skillful. The Petersons have Blue Cross - Blue Shield and John Hancock Life Insurance. They are practicing Catholics and will be re-married in the Catholic Church next month.

Phil and Mary both feel that they would like to disassociate themselves from ex-PHTC people. They feel they would like to forget the past and want to make sure the children are not by any stigma affected. On trips to Branford, they do see some ex-PHTC people.

Phil felt that most of the ex-PHTC's had problems because they do not want to work. He stated he found it hard learning to be responsible, but since this lesson was learned, their problems have been fewer. Phil appears to be both responsible and ambitious. He is also sensitive to his wife's needs and tries to shield her from financial worries.

This is a very warm home, and despite the fact that the Petersons will never be rich, they will probably continue to lead stable and happy lives. Their children also should do well.

***

Two additional examples of workable marriages are given. These are "exogamous" in that the dischargees' spouses are not also dischargees of PHTC but have always been regular community members. Economically much more spectacular examples could have been selected, but they would have been rather less representative of most cases at this level. These two marriages are not without problems, but none of them is so severe as to threaten the equilibrium of the stable relationships.

The first example describes an older dischargee, Ethel Warren. For many of this age, the obtainable male spouse may be in some way disabled, living partially or wholly on a pension, or may be past the age of 60 or 65.

The second example, Gabrielle Desjardins, represents a much younger marriage, and one scarcely distinguishable from other normal marriages at this socio-economic level. If admitted in an earlier, custodial era, this dischargee's life story would doubtless have been a far different one.

ETHEL WARREN

Born 1910. Admitted in 1932 at age 22. Trial visits in 1954, with discharge in 1959 at age 49. Another "familial". 54 was the IQ on a 1932 Revised Binet. A 1953 WB yielded IQ scores of Verbal 66, Performance 72, Full Scale 66.

Ethel seems to have lived with rather marginal parents until she was 17, at which time the parents separated or were divorced. There was an illegitimate child, and a year later a marriage to a middle-aged man. One of the two legitimate children subsequently born did not live. Economically poor performance, "idle and disorderly conduct", or whatever, won her admission to the Women's Reformatory, and transfer to PSS. The parents and later on particularly her daughter maintained contact with her through the years, but not the husband (he died in 1951). Ethel had an aimiable and pleasant disposition, and in her letters sounds brighter than the IQ score would suggest. The interviewer's account that follows finds her married to a Wallace Lamb:

The Lambs live in a small, nondescript camp just outside of Farnsworth on the Moriah Road. There was strewn about the yard various rusted-out objects, machine parts, etc., all in the category of scrap iron (Mr. L. is a junk collector in the warm months). Earlier I had tried unsuccessfully to contact Ethel's daughter, who lives townward about three miles from the ex-pt. and works at the local hospital; she and hub have recently moved into a new, cozy-looking little five-room bungalow which hub built.

Mrs. Lamb is in her mid-fifties, short and rather stout, but seemingly in good health. She was very calm, pleasant from the start of the interview as was her husband. The couple were married about six months after her discharge from PHTC. Mr. L. was at that time a widower of some fifteen years without much intention of marrying again, but the couple he had boarded with for ten years had died, and he didn't want a life of loneliness and drifting from one place to another, he said, so these two had gotten hitched. Both in their fifties, they seem to have settled rather easily into a state of domestic tranquility with only the old bugaboo of poverty to surmount.

Mr. Lamb looks quite a bit older than Ethel, with his pure white hair and face gnarled and creased with wrinkles. He sustained a spinal injury when his tank overturned in WW II. His injury left him partially paralyzed. He hasn't worked regularly for ten years and receives both a Vet's pension and Social Security. Periodically he apparently has bad spells which almost totally incapacitate him. During the warm months, however, he collects junk. Ethel goes right along with him as his helper in the old pick-up they own. She lifts the heavier objects, she says, and good-naturedly adds, "I am a regular old junk lady now!" Mr. L. is a proud man which makes him a little bitter over his condition, but not unduly so as he is both intelligent and witty.

One thing that definitely aggravates Mr. H. is the presence in the home of Ethel's 33-year-old son, Eugene, who apparently spends every winter with them. The rest of the year Eugene washes windows in Massachusetts. Ethel says Eugene is married, but his wife is in the State Hospital. One of his eyes is completely closed so that there is only a slit where the eye would be. He was puttering around outside during most of the interview but came in briefly in the beginning, and at one point during some questions about finances, asked if his mother might not qualify for Social Security. Mr. Lamb immediately snapped at him for interrupting me, and said if he wanted to ask questions he should wait until I was finished. Eugene very sheepishly made some excuse that he was only asking, etc. He seemed somewhat dull mentally, but his behavior, in that instance at least, did not warrant such an outburst from his stepfather, so I assume there is a fairly steady antagonism between the two men. Ethel did not come to Eugene's defense, but later she told me in a low voice that he "helps them a lot." A short time after Eugene had left the house, Mr. L. went to the window and exclaimed that "the darn fool" had just shovelled some snow back into the driveway he had previously cleared. Mr. L. then resolved to deliver a lecture when Eugene came inside. (A lot of haranguing may have been the result of the frustrations of a semi-invalid.) He and Ethel seem well suited to one another, both seeming to be basically kind, non-contentious individuals. Mr. L. kiddingly says that occasionally he clouts her on the nose. Ethel reacts to this remark by quietly smiling. Financially, Mr. L. says they manage to get by without getting help from anyone. (He did investigate the possibility of Ethel qualifying for a disability pension.) Ethel walks to town (a distance of several miles) for their groceries. Her ruggedness is a source of pride to them both and a subject of good-natured banter.

Ethel has had very little post-discharge employment. She worked about five months as a dishwasher in a Farnsworth restaurant before her marriage, but was not employed again until August, 1964, when she washed dishes in a diner a mile or two from their home. In a month's time the owner had gone out of business, and she has not worked since then, other than to assist her husband with the junk business. She does not actively seek work, but says she would take a job if it were offered to her.

These two are markedly affectionate with animals (have two dogs & a cat), and took in one dog and cat which were going to be destroyed. These pets have the run of the house, as one dog was snoozing comfortably on their unmade bed. The camp was not dirty, but I think Ethel is a rather careless (or carefree) housekeeper.

Ethel numbered several ex-PSS among her friends, naming Eunice Crosby, Marion Haskell, and Myrna Pye (who since our interview has gone to Florida for the winter with her daughter and husband). Ethel didn't respond very much to inquiries about her PSS days, other than to make very favorable comments about Mother Mag, Mrs. Park, and Jo Goodwin.

***

GABRIELLE DESJARDINS

Born 1939. Admitted in 1955 at age 15. Trial visits in 1958 and discharge in that year, at age 19, to "Self and Employer." In 1955, a Stanford Binet yielded IQ score of 59, and a WISC Full Scale was 70. Not untypical for this more recent era at Pineland, the IQ had by 1958 increased on a WAIS to the following - Verbal 86, Performance 85, Full Scale 85.

Gabrielle was the illegitimate child of a disreputable mother who after a checkered career was sent to Women's Reformatory. Gabrielle, then 5 years old, passed to Health and Welfare custody and five different foster home placements by the time she was 9. There followed a five year stretch of Orphan Annie slave labor in the fifth home, and some rather bizarre behavior. Slated for PHTC, she was temporarily placed at a sixth home where a Mr. and Mrs. Renaud became quite attached to her. During her stay at PHTC it was to this home that she went for "home visits" and vacations, and it was these people whom she called "mother" and "father". The combined influence of these foster parents and latterday PHTC education transformed a retardate with sex and other behavior problems into a normal and domesticated young girl. The interviewer's account that follows finds Gabrielle married to a Victor Harris:

Monument Heights is located in the Lake Nanticook area of the town of Matson, about five miles from the center. This is a rural area. Many of the homes are modern and ranch style, while others are old remodeled barns, camps, etc. Gabrielle's home is a small camp type. It is, however, finished, freshly painted, etc. Inside there are three rooms. The living room & dining area is good sized. It contains some chairs, a dinette set, a TV set, and scattered toys. The room was clean but in general disarray. An array of broken dolls filled one corner, and various toys, trucks, etc., were scattered about. Three children were in the living room playing when I arrived. All appeared to be bright, healthy, young people. Gabrielle is a small, pretty, brown-haired girl, with large brown eyes. She was friendly toward me, although she was a little nervous about the reasons for my visit. She seemed to be young and enthusiastic. Sometimes she appeared shy and soft-spoken, and at others, quite outgoing.

The Harrises are busy building another home in Forward, Maine, which will be larger. Hubby works at the Norton Textile Mill, owns a car; both are seriously involved in the Pentacostal Church, hubby perhaps more so than Gabrielle. From Gabrielle's description, hubby is a stay-at-home, extremely religious. He disapproves of many worldly pleasures, e.g., television, movies, card playing. Gabrielle follows hubby's directive, except that she does occasionally watch television. Her interest in her religion is strong, but I felt her interest in the happiness of hubby and the children was stronger. She does feel, however, that her religion helps her to lead a better life and to give her children a better home.

Gabrielle's work experience consists of three jobs she had prior to her marriage. She worked at TV placement, for a woman in Spednoc, and at the textile mill in Branford. She left her last job to come to Matson and marry Victor. Gabrielle stated that she visits her folks in Branford as often as possible, and that hubby and she were planning on spending Thanksgiving there. By "her folks," Gabrielle meant foster parents, Mr. & Mrs. Renaud.

Gabrielle seems to have great respect for her husband and value his wishes. She still, however, maintains her individuality and has several interests which he does not share. She appears to have no trouble with money matters, etc.

Gabrielle attributes her success to the Renauds, who offered support and encouragement in the past. Gabrielle noted that she and hubby did not attend church the first year they were married, but started later at the suggestion of Mrs. Renaud.

Supported by secure relationships with the Renauds and hubby, Gabrielle seems to be functioning well. She seems to be very alert, has well formed opinions of her own, and is warmly attentive to her children. She appears to be more stable than hubby sounds. (i.e., Hubby is 20 years old, all of a sudden a religious fanatic.) This is somewhat speculative of course, and he does appear to be a steady worker, etc. One wonders, however, what his state under stress would be.

Regardless of what should happen to hubby, Gabrielle will function well. The Renauds have evidently given her enough support and affection in the past to enable her to stand on her own two feet.

***

Four cases, of unmarried dischargees, complete this final section. Although single, they are by no means isolated and are in varying ways and degrees involved with society. The first example is of a successful but small scale materialist, one of the more prestigious members of the Morganton "group" of dischargees. His material triumphs are, to be sure, offset by a certain voluntary non-commitment to a more altruistic social maturity.

WILFRED BENNETT

Born 1915. Admitted in 1931 at age 15. An unsuccessful TV in 1946, followed in 1955 by a series that ended in discharge in 1958, at age 43. A 1931 Revised Binet gave an IQ score of 46. A 1953 WB gave scores of Verbal 80, Performance 88, Full Scale 83.

There is remarkably little information about Wilfred's childhood in the case history. He was apparently illegitimate, retained ties with a poorly educated mother, and was sent at about age 14 to State School for Boys (correctional) on a charge of malicious mischief. After his transfer to PSS, his mother made a number of attempts to effect his release, but to no avail. She died in 1937, and there seem to have been no other relatives, most certainly no interested relatives. Several maladjusted trial visits were followed by a successful one and eventual discharge. In the interviewer's account that follows, the other persons described are also dischargees.

Wilfred had called the Dellenbaughs while I was there and suggested that I drop over to see him. (This after weeks of evasion and assurances by Bill Dellenbaugh that he would neither be mocked nor intimidated.) The Dellenbaughs moved to Bennett's, as they were interested in a movie on the colored tube.

Mr. B.'s apartment was large and very well kept. Christmas decorations and material possessions filled the rooms. Among them: one color television, guitars, banjos, a stereo, a movie projector, portable television set, and a pink Princess phone. Wilfred took much delight in showing me these things and seemed much like a child in a room full of toys.

Wilfred is a slightly gray-haired, Mediterranean looking man -- probably Greek. (In the case history, his national origins are very obscure.)

When discharged he was working on a farm in Blacksmith Falls and remained there a month. He then went to work for the Mandarin Hotel and has been employed here for six years. At the Mandarin he does some short-order cooking and all-around kitchen work.

Wilfred owns a pink Lincoln convertible ('59) but does not have a driver's license -- Dennis Rourke drives this car -- Wilfred has a permit and swears he is more prudent than Gerald Agostino.

Wilfred has mused about marrying Madeleine Boynton, but is reluctant to do so as it would necessitate some sacrifices in "the good life" which he now leads. He did, however, live with her for a couple of months (Sept.-Oct., '64). Wilfred's bills are plentiful but probably not excessive.

Wilfred seems to take a greater interest in the surrounding world, society, etc., than others in the Morganton group. He plays the guitar and banjo and harmonica, collects records, reads travel books and Science Fiction.

He seems quite capable mentally, though a little child-like, and at times even a little scatterbrained. Now that he is out, Wilfred explains, he wants all the comforts which he was deprived of, and he will not sacrifice these for anything. Wilfred seems like a great center of attraction for the group, and may be almost of the same stature as Bill Dellenbaugh. Wilfred said that he likes to live alone, as then there are no problems with roommate not paying the rent, or wrecking the place.

Wilfred had been very apprehensive about an impending visit from PHTC Social Worker. This was explained because it was not anyone he knew. He also feels that he would like to forget the place now that he is finally out.

***

The next case describes an economically self-sufficient and socially independent female dischargee.

BEATRICE KNIGHT

> Born 1924. Admitted in 1938 at age 13. Trial visits began in 1956, with discharge in 1957, at age 33. In 1937 a Revised Binet had given the IQ as 66. In 1954 a WB gave scores of Verbal 73, Performance 85, Full Scale 77.
>
> Beatrice had lived with her parents continually, and had attended public school, until she and her siblings were sent to PSS. This was an unloading operation conducted by town selectmen and county welfare agencies to get all the Knight children off the town and into Pownal. The rather indigent parents did not or could not make much effort toward release, moved about the countryside, and seem to have been later divorced. At PHTC and on trial visits, Beatrice showed herself to be sensible, affectionate, able to save money and to manage her own affairs. There is reference to a discharged sister and two still institutionalized siblings in the interviewer's account that follows:

Beatrice has her own small second-floor apartment located close to the Majorport Medical Center where she has been employed the last 18 months in the housekeeping department. This is a fairly quiet, respectable, working-class neighborhood.

Beatrice had been upset and nervous about the survey, but I had already talked to her sister, Rosa, the previous week, and this helped to pave the way for me. Rosa visits Beatrice often, and she had reassured her sister that this was nothing but "a lot of questions."

Beatrice makes a great deal of severing all ties with PSS. This is one reason that she deliberately avoids any relationship with other ex-patient acquaintances. She says they always dwell on their past here, and she wants to "move ahead." There is a lot of good, practical sense in Beatrice's approach to life. She seems to feel a bit more secure and assertive than Rosa, which means that she has experimented more and has more dimension to her personality, in my opinion.

In comparison to Rosa's strong maternal identification with her employer, Beatrice lives alone, travels freely and often to Massachusetts to see her father, and even took several factory jobs there but got laid off and came back to Maine. She likes factory work but finds that these jobs are no longer secure, so she has settled down to the steady employment guaranteed at Majorport Medical Center. As with most hospital jobs, the pay is very modest, but Beatrice handles her money well, lives quite comfortably, and has bought, among other things, a very nice looking stereo outfit. She is strongly against buying on credit, doesn't buy anything without the cash to pay for it. Consequently she has very little savings, but she has taken out her own insurance and seems to have adequately insulated herself against unforseen emergencies. Again this very down-to-earth practicality was evident.

Unlike her sister, she seems rather interested in eventual marriage, and has a boyfriend she is quite taken with. She is always looking for hobbies, likes to work with her hands, and has taken up some painting by the numbers, as well as sewing, which she has enjoyed for some time. As for friends, she likes a few close friends rather than a lot of acquaintances. They are mostly girls that she works with at the hospital.

Beatrice worked at Sullivan's Nursing Home along with sister Rosa, for about two years, but didn't seem to take to the personal care of patients, being a bit squeamish about some duties. She said Mrs. Sullivan offered to teach her nurses-aide work as she had done with Rosa, but this had not interested her too much. (I wonder also if she might not have felt a little cramped there.) She has a close, affectionate relationship with Rosa, sees her as a very capable girl, but also pictures herself as being somewhat protective of her more timid sister. (Beatrice is actually three years younger.) The actual differences between these two women seem rather subtle since they are basically very much alike, both being sweet, rather shy, but sensible and conscientious. Neither of them appears close to other siblings. In Beatrice's case, she doesn't like to visit Carroll or Elizabeth at PHTC because of her feelings about the school, and apparently Elizabeth does not even realize that Beatrice is her sister. Beatrice seems closer to her father than Rosa is. The father was widowed recently. Beatrice didn't say much about her mother, but apparently she also sees her occasionally in Massachusetts.

Beatrice commented that she had "worried about nothing" concerning the survey. Once she had gotten over her uneasiness, she showed herself to be very gracious, warm, and sociable.

***

In this penultimate illustration we are indulging in one of our several Horatio Alger stories. Here, the significantly instrumental factors are not primarily the improved facilities at Pineland but new institutional policies that recognize and utilize improved educational and other programs that have been inaugurated in recent years for the retarded in the general community.

The last decade at Pineland has been marked by a drastic reduction in the number of educable retardates in the institutional population. A large institution must necessarily function as a self-sufficient and to some extent socially isolated microcosm, and it is recognized that long term placement of the educable retardate in such an environment may eventually deprive him of more learning experiences and general and social education than it can give him. Accordingly, the newer policy has been not to admit younger educable retardates to the institution when they can function acceptably in a domestic environment in the community and when special and other educational and training facilities are available to them in the community.

In this case at hand, the return of the patient to his home coincided with the beginning, in 1956, of special school facilities for the retarded in his area. A charter member of these classes, this dischargee gives us a heartening example of what such programs, properly supported, can accomplish.

DONALD SIMARD

Born 1944. Admitted in 1955 at age 10. Prolonged home visit began a year later, with formal discharge in 1957 at age 12. Chronic brain syndrome associated with birth trauma. In 1955, Stanford Binet, WISC, and Goodenough all placed the IQ in a 62 - 67 range.

Donald was the firstborn child of industrious and respectable French Canadian parents, who reacted to his special problems with overprotection, highly emotional overindulgence, and apparent lack of any real discipline. Donald became a hyperactive, nervous, destructive boy with severe behavior problems. He was expelled from school, and was known to the police for setting fires. The parents sought his admission to PHTC for purposes of supervision and (mistakenly) as a punitive measure. The effect of Pineland's more structured environment, greater parental understanding of his problems and how to deal with them, and the presence of new special classes in the community -- all combined to facilitate Donald's discharge to his home. The interviewer's account takes up the history some seven years later:

> The Simard home is located in a new development some distance from the downtown area of Morganton. Numerous children, bicycles, and tricycles lined the street, and the area did not look much different from areas of Connecticut or Long Island (new homes -- every other one in same pattern but array of colors, blue, pink, yellow, etc.). Mr. Simard gave me a friendly welcome as did his two daughters. Mr. looked like a former quarterback, short but well built. He was very nice looking with a pleasing personality and spoke with a slight French accent. Every so often he would break off into French, to explain something more fully and also to talk to the daughters. One had the impression that French was spoken in the family. He seemed very conscious of his French heritage and said that this was an "all-French" neighborhood.
>
> He explained that Donald was out on one of his jobs (lawyer Will Tarkinson) with his company. He said that Donald had started out mowing lawns by himself, and business prospered so much that he hired others, bought a truck and several mowers. He had thought it best that I come when Donald was out working as the latter was quite sensitive about his past. He (Donald) and his mother had both been rather upset when the letter had come, thinking that someone was checking up on him and might want to take him back. This was the reason for mother's abruptness on the phone yesterday, and why he had intercepted the phone call. Father said that Donald gets very upset at the mention of the place. This, he feels, is because he was so homesick there, and because he is afraid he will have to go back.
>
> Mrs. Simard said that Donald has suddenly begun to learn quickly, and is progressing quite fast. He has been taking courses in reading at Morganton High School night school, and has progressed to the sixth grade level already. He reads newspapers and takes books out of the library, which are one step above his level, and learns to read them. He is extremely persistent at this, and father said that improvement of his education is very important to Donald. He feels this is partially due to the influence of his sisters who are both "A" students at Morganton High School. They have books around the house, and Donald frequently picks them up. He is also around when they do their homework, and Donald learns from this. Another factor may be that Donald has developed friendships with upper-middle and upper class residents of the Morganton-Chester area through his work, and father feels that these people may have helped stimulate his interest in education. Other interests include photography and cooking. Father explained that the mother works, and Donald often cooks dinner because "he enjoys it so." He has a driver's license and drives "all over the state and to Canada."
>
> Father says the boy is fully self-supporting. He buys his own clothes, pays board and business expenses. Father says he is very fussy about his clothes and buys expensive ones. Donald has no trouble doing his own bookkeeping and keeps records of who owes and who pays. Some people pay him directly, and others are sent bills monthly. Mr. Simard proudly stated that Donald has the new truck all paid for, and also the mowers. This he paid for out of his savings. Donald has savings left now. Father thought it must be around $500-$700. In the winter to make up for the loss of work, Donald sells juice door to door. Father said that he has all his lawn customers signed up, as through the summer property care and winter ploughing business, Donald has

developed a wide number of contacts. Mr. Simard said that the boy is financially better off than he is and has more business contacts than he does. He remarked that Donald is friendly with some of the prominent members of the community, and from time to time has introduced the father to them. Through contacts, Donald has been helping father find a new job. Father had been doing some kind of managerial work at the Fickett Mill in Cordoba which recently closed down.

Mr. Simard thought the boy had been helped "a little" at PHTC, but real improvement came after the boy attended special classes and Morganton High School. He remarked that he had all kinds of difficulty getting Donald out of PHTC and had sought the help of a Dr. Warren of Morganton, who was a friend of Dr. Bowman's. The Dr. suggested that he talk to Dr. Bowman rather than employ a lawyer, and Mr. Simard did so. Mr. Simard was very impressed with Dr. Bowman, and said that he had discharged Donald almost immediately. He also mentioned a Mrs. Woodman who had been very helpful to him.

Father indicated that Donald gets along very well with all the family, save occasional spats with sisters about the messing of his room and borrowing records and books and not returning them. Donald came in when I was leaving and did not realize who I was. He was a lanky six-footer, very lively and handsome.

This case is an interesting study in delayed learning. Donald was diagnosed at PHTC as a moron with a chronic brain syndrome due to birth trauma. This raises interesting questions as to how much learning is possible even with organic problems. Prior to admittance, there was also a behavior problem which has since disappeared. One wonders how much the personality factor enters into the picture, especially the fact that this boy seems extremely ambitious. There are other factors that might be relevant here -- the fact that he has friends in higher socio-economic class than his parents, the bi-lingualism in his home and neighborhood, etc. At any rate, this boy seems to be progressing at a normal rate, the only difference being his age.

***

Today, material possessions, sensual pleasures, and social, political, and financial power demand our plaudits and our pursuit. To their greatest and most engorged gainer goes the greatest esteem.

Here, as our final entry, is Miles Kent, aged 59. He is single, earns about $75 a month -- less than $1,000 a year, and he lives in a starkly furnished two-room shack in one of Maine's most economically depressed and geographically remote regions.

His case is presented to invite reflection on what constitutes "success" in the best and most enduring human terms.

MILES KENT

Born 1905. Admitted in 1919 at age 14. There was "odd job" or day work from 1942 on. Trial visits began in 1954, with discharge in 1958 at age 53. A Revised Binet in 1920 gave a score of 70, with the notation, "intelligent, interested, will improve." A 1953 WB yielded IQ scores of Verbal 76, Performance 82, Full Scale 75.

Miles was the illegitimate son of a marginal and perhaps retarded mother who seems to have come from a better family. By the time Miles was 2, there was a stepfather on the scene "who could not tolerate the boy." Six or seven half-siblings are reported. Family living conditions were impoverished and inadequate, and his mother died of pneumonia when Miles was 14. The selectmen of his town and the New England Home for Little Wanderers, that took custody, sent him to Massachusetts where an expert certified that he was feeble-minded and advised institutionalization. The advice was followed.

In the earlier years, there was some contact with an aunt, uncles, and a grandmother, but this was not sufficient to effect his release. Described as an industrious worker, he always wanted to go out "to earn his own living." Somehow, he was never flattened out by the years of institutionalization. After discharge, it was to his own town of origin that he returned. Miles was interviewed in October of 1964, and the interviewer's account of that visit follows:

When I reached Kolberg, the storm I had been driving in grew worse. The wind blew off the sea in a gale while the streets filled up with water. Although this was indeed a bad time for surveying the landscape, I did manage to feel somewhat the heart of the place. Kolberg is strictly a fishing village, located south of Thuleport and across from New Brunswick. The streets at the land's end grow extremely narrow. The area is a peninsula surrounded on three sides by the ocean. The main street contains a dry-goods store, a drugstore, gift shop, water & power office, and a couple of restaurants. It is rather barren, and there is a sidewalk only on one side of the street. On the side nearest the ocean, there are a series of wharves. Boats could be seen bobbing up and down, and the whole main street area smelled of dead fish. The people around, mostly men, were quite curious and all were wearing ponchos and fishing boots.

The village is spread out - the houses are little white boxes with green or black shutters that are nestled in the hills overlooking the sea. The only thing which disrupts the horizontal look, is the vertical spire of the local Congregational Church.

Most of the homes in the area were in dilapidated condition. They appeared to be abandoned but were not. Here in this community, unemployment has reached the 50% mark. There are few, if any, people between 18-35. Those left are moving out quickly. There is a cloud of impending doom hanging over the towns of Kolberg and N. Kolberg. In the many places I stopped for directions, I was greeted as a savior - could it be that I had something to do with the war on poverty? There were Marxist prophecies of an impending great battle between capital and labor. There were many hungry people, willing to look anywhere.

Miles Kent was located in N. Kolberg - about three miles towards Thuleport and separated from it by a bay of water. Here, the homes were in even worse condition than in Kolberg proper. In the center of town was a post office, general store, and dry-goods store, all deserted. I asked again for directions to Miles' place and found families with the man of the house at home. Miles lived in a two-room shack, a few houses up from the post office. He was a tall, rugged looking man with a high forehead, blue eyes, and sandy hair now touched with grey. The shack was barren and contained a wood stove, a table, a chair, a bed, and a radio.

Shortly after our conversation began, a young man about 30 appeared and announced that he was there to read the meter. This he did, and then turned to me, said he was a selectman in town. He then began to explain the plight of the two cities. He said that all but ten in N. Kolberg were unemployed. The town had run out of money and food to help them. The local grocery store is losing money rapidly and prices fluctuate monthly. A medium size jar of instant coffee cost .98 one month and $2.00 the next. He began to produce these items with prices on them. He explained that the city of N. Kolberg was bankrupt and Kolberg was about to be in the same condition. There is considerable doubt that they will be able to pay their teachers. People in town have little to eat and the children steal food from the grocery stores. At the same time, the selectman praised Miles, said that he had a struggle because of his lack of education, and also because of the unemployment situation. Miles was employed by the city this summer but was forced to stop because the city no longer had money to pay their workers. The selectman said that if there was anything I could do for Miles and the town, he would be grateful. Miles lost two toes in the city job, and the selectman said that he felt that Miles did not eat properly, in fact, no one in town did. He praised Miles for courage and industry. He said he has refused any kind of aid and works constantly to keep himself alive.

This speech left Miles embarrassed with tears streaming down his cheeks. When the man left, he told me that he did not want aid, would refuse aid, when children are starving. If he got it, he said, he would use it to feed the many hungry families.

He then began to recall the days at PSS. He spoke of the scouting trips and training. One of the training exercises was to crawl on the ground in the mud on your belly for 3/4 of a mile. He recalled the jobs he had in the boiler room, Valley Farm, in construction, and the many personalities -- Hawkes, Merrill, Whitcomb, Wilder, Dr. Stangood, Mrs. Drake, Mother Mag, and Napolitano. He expressed great affection for Sherman Merrill, Napolitano, and Mrs. Drake.

He recalled days of baseball and hockey matches with the employees. All this he recalled fondly. He produced the ball and glove which won him fame as a pitcher at PSS and recalled beating the Colby Frosh, 4-1.

From time to time he brought up subjects of current interest. He discussed missiles - mostly the construction of and detection systems. He also discussed the negro problem, Berlin, the recent power shake-up in Russia, and Barry Goldwater. The latter he contended was crazy and dangerous. The selectman had given him history and government books, also economics, which he reads with the help of a dictionary. He likes Galbraith but at the same time, expounds Marxist slogans, as there will soon be a war in this country between capital and labor. He feels hard-hit, by the education requirement, the need for highly technical skills. The latter does not bother him as much as the former. Miles is the kind of man that is willing to learn anything new and has often not gotten jobs because of his lack of education. He was saddened by the fact that the world no longer will give the self-made man a chance. Since his discharge he has worked as a waiter, plumber, farmer, logger, fisherman, landscaper, tree cutter, street sweeper, mechanic, babysitter, cook, domestic, electrical repairman, has repaired radios and TV sets, cars, etc.

According to both Miles and the selectman, Miles works constantly. Since he lost the job with the city, he has gone to people's homes and looked for mowing, cleaning, and babysitting jobs. He subs in the local gas stations. He is on call at the smoking factory in New Brunswick. He chops wood and sells it. Most people have wood stoves for heat and all need wood.

He keeps in touch with his sister in Moriah and has been like a father to her son. Sister's husband is a drinker and no one would discipline the son until he came along. Miles was concerned about youth and felt they had things so easy that they remained soft, unformed personalities. They never were forced to exert themselves for anything meaningful and thus, lacked any sense of worth and identity. Miles is stubborn, hot-tempered, and a firm believer in hard work and rigid self-discipline.

As he was an orphan at an early age, I seriously doubt if his was a condition of anything but deprivation. He has a keen mind, basically is a Jack-of-all-trades and a self-educated man. I felt he had amazing perception. At PSS he seemed to be helped most by the work he did and the people he met. Mentally he is normal if not well above normal. His problems seem to stem from a lack of any formal education and the geographic location he is in.

***

EPILOGUE

> Granted, the ship comes into harbor with shrouds and tackle damaged; the pilot is blameworthy; he has not been all-wise and all-powerful; but to know how blameworthy, tell us first whether his voyage has been round the Globe or only to Ramsgate and the Isle of Dogs.
>
> Thomas Carlyle

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS, ETC.

AD	Aid to the Disabled
ADC	Aid to Dependent Children
B	Basal or rock-bottom (designation for lowest social class level)
BTC	Boys Training Center (correctional), same as SSB
H&W	Department of Health and Welfare
LB	Lower to Basal (designation for next to lowest social class level)
LM	Lower-Middle (social class designation)
M	Middle (social class designation)
MR	Men's Reformatory (correctional)
MSFM	Maine School for the Feeble-Minded: Pineland's earliest title (1908)
MSP	Maine State Prison
NH	Nursing Home
OAA	Old Age Assistance
Peterson	See MSP
PHTC	Pineland Hospital & Training Center
PSS	Pownal State School: Pineland's earlier but not first title
PV	Prolonged Visit - a longer home visit with relatives or others
SS	Social Security
SSB	State School for Boys (correctional)
SSG	State School for Girls (correctional)
TV	Trial Visit - a working placement in the community
UM	Upper Middle (a social class designation)
VA	Veterans Administration
WB	Wechsler Bellvue intelligence test
WR	Women's Reformatory (correctional)

Personal

DSA	Mrs. Anderson, one of PHTC's longer tenure social workers
BAB	Miss Britten, one of our interviewers (also Miss B.)
LHD	Miss Dwinal, one of our interviewers
JG	Mrs. Goodwin, one of PHTC's longer tenure social workers

ED0 43152

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER
BOX C, POWNAL, MAINE 04069

PETER W. BOWMAN, M.D.
SUPERINTENDENT

TABULAR SUPPLEMENT

TO

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

JOHN L. HOFFMAN, Ph.D.

REPORT ON PROJECT RD-1606-P

TO THE
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

EC 030 026E

12

EC030026

ED043152

TABULAR SUPPLEMENT

to

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISCHARGED RETARDATES

RD-1606-P

Peter W. Bowman, M.D.
Project Director

John L. Hoffman, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator & Author

PINELAND HOSPITAL AND TRAINING CENTER
Box C
Pownal, Maine 04069

September 30, 1969

This investigation was supported, in part, by
Research Grant No. RD-1606-P from the
Division of Research and Demonstration Grants
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C., 20201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

This is the Tabular Supplement to the formal Final Report on a research project that is a multifaceted longitudinal study of all patients who were discharged from Pineland Hospital and Training Center from July, 1952 through June, 1961, a total of 569 subjects. Pineland is the State of Maine's sole residential facility for the education, training, and treatment of the retarded.

The three principle sections of this Tabular Supplement cover three main life areas of the dischargees -- from birth to admission to the institution; from admission to discharge, a period that for some covered many years; and from discharge to the time of follow up data collection, which comes from four to ten years after discharge.

By giving a quite complete statistical description of this entire dischargee population, this supplement aims to serve several purposes. One of these is to present a statistical-ethnographic portrait of this unique and special genre so that the disciplines and agencies that deal with institutional dischargees in our state and in other states may have a fuller and more useful understanding of them. Another purpose is to provide a more complete informational background against which to interpret the more complex statistical analyses described in the Final Report. An implicit and additional purpose is of course to reveal exactly what did happen after discharge to such an institutional population, to show how its members have fared, and what they have accomplished. As better than 98% follow up coverage was obtained, representation here is reasonably complete.

Although the tabular form is not the most glib, it should, if followed with some care, prove helpful in realizing the above purposes. Ethnographically, for example, these tables do give among other things a detailed account of the socially and psychologically deprived and structurally disrupted nature of the backgrounds from which so many of our patients came; for the post-discharge period, there is considerable information on types of employment, wages and wage levels, marriage, and the surprisingly low rate of procreation, and on many other social, economic, and personal aspects of the lives of the dischargees.

TABLE INDEX

PRE-ADMISSION PERIOD

	Table #
No. of Pre-Disch. Subjects	1
Date of Birth	2
Birthplace	3 - 4A
Civil Status	5
Children Born	6 - 7
Religion	8
Level of Social Functioning	9
Employment	10
General Health	11
Property Destruction	12
Theft	13
Behavior Toward Mother	14
Behavior Toward Father	15
Overt Sexual Behavior	16 - 18
General "Obedience"	19
Escapes	20 - 21
Type of Education	22 - 23
School Grade	24 - 26
Prior I.Q.	27
Language(s) Learned	28
Age at Identification	29
Ident. as Retarded By:	30 - 31
Parental Denial	32
Negative Social Hist.	33 - 34
Soc. Structure of Home	35 - 37
Of Legitimate Birth	38
Separation of Parents	39
No. of Structural Breaks	40
Admission to Pineland	40A
Struct. Breaks	41 - 41E
No. of Sibs in Sibship	42
No. of Males in Sibship	43
No. of Females in Sibship	44
Birth Order of Pt.	45
One of Twins	46
Soc. Mod. of Sib Order	47
Ethnicity of Mother	48
Ethnicity of Father	49
Race of Mother	50
Race of Father	51
Social Class of Mother	52
Mother, Rur.-Urban Type	53
Social Class of Father	54
Father, Rur.-Urban Type	55
Other Adults in Home	56
Social Class of Other	57
Other, Rur.-Urban Type	58
Mother's Education	59
Father's Education	60
Mother's Religion	61
Father's Religion	62
Mother's Attitude	63 - 64
Father's Attitude	65 - 66
Mother's Mental Health	67
Father's Mental Health	68
Mo's Institut. History	69
Fa's Institut. History	70
Other's Institut. History	71 - 76

INSTITUTIONAL PERIOD

	Table #
Type of Admission	77
Initiators of Admission	78 - 79
Overt Cause for Admiss.	80 - 81
True Cause for Admiss.	82 - 83
Age at Admission	84
Age at Discharge	85
Age at First Visit	86
Year of Admission	87
Year of Discharge	88
First Community Visit	89
Mental Level on Entry	90
Mental Level on Exit	91
Actual Pineland Stay	92
Legal Pineland Stay	93
I.Q. on Admission	94
I.Q. on Exit	95
I.Q. Tests Used	96 - 97
I.Q. Maximum Ranges	98
I.Q. Minimum Ranges	99
I.Q. Tests Used	100
Date of Testing	101
I.Q. Tests Used	102
Date of Testing	103
Etiology on Entry	104
Etiology on Exit	105
Emotional Stability	106
Psycol. Diagnosis	107
General Health	108
Types of Illness	109
Handicap	110 - 116
Academic Training	117
Special Class	118
Other Types of Classes	119
Era of Training	120
Vocational Classes	121
Other Types of Voc. Train.	122
Era of Training	123
O. Remedial Treatment	124
Level of Soc. Functioning	125
Attitudes Re. Acad. Work	126
Attitudes Re. Vocat. Work	127
Property Destruction	128
Theft	129
Behavior Toward Personnel	130
Behavior Toward Peers	131

	Table #
Overt Sexual Behavior	132 - 133
Illegitimate Children	134 - 135
General "Obedience"	136
Escapes from Institut.	137 - 138
Efforts for Discharge	139 - 140
Family Visits to Instit.	141 - 142
Patient's Home Visits	143
Room & Board Payments	144
Clothing Supplied	145
Pt's Release Efforts	146 - 147
Extramural Odd Jobs	148
Trial Visit Employment	149
Prolonged (Home) Visits	150
Short Trial Visits	151
TV, STV, PV Terminations	152 - 152A
Persons Discharged To	153
Conditions of Discharge	154
Improved at Discharge	155
Location at Discharge	156

POST-DISCHARGE PERIOD

Interview Type	157 - 158
Other Sources	159
Living or Dead	160
Year of Death	161
Causes of Death	162
General Health	163 - 165
Present Religion	166
Military Service	167 - 169
Married Since Discharge	170
Type of Marriage	171
Number of Marriages	172
Still with Spouse	173
Year of Last Marriage	174
Reason Not with Spouse	175
Parenthood	176 - 184
Residence of Children	185 - 194
Aid Dependent Children	195 - 196
Spouse Living	197
Present or Last Spouse	198
Spouse's Year of Birth	199
Spouse's Age	200
Spouse's Age Rel. to Pt.	201
Spouse's Marriages	202
Spouse Prior Mar. Status	203
Spouse's Ethnicity	204
Spouse's Religion	205
Spouse's Soc. Class Level	206
Spouse Rur.-Urban Type	207
Spouse's Education	208
Spouse Employment	209 - 210
Spouse Income Per Month	211
Spouse Annual Income	212
Spouse Income Source	213

	Table #
Spouse From Pineland	214
Time in Present Domicile	215
Entry Date, Pres. Domicile	216
Custodial Residence	217
Type of Custodial Resid.	218
Independently Domiciled	219
Type of Housing	220 - 221
Housing Finances	222
Protect. Housed W. Rel.	223
Pays Rm. &/or Bd. to Rel.	224
Employer's Housing	225
Other Housing	226
Region of Domicile	227
Residence	228 - 229
No. Physical Domiciles	230
No. Personnel Domiciles	231
Post-Disch. Instit. Hist.	232
Type of Institution	233
Duration of Instit.	234
Domicile Network	235 - 238
Number of Diff. Jobs	239
Present or Last Job	240
Duration of Job	241
Pre-Discharge Employer	242
Reason Not Employed	243
Channels to Employment	244 - 245
Work Rating	246 - 249
Formal Training	250
Informal Training	251
Formal Agency Support	252
Other Individuals' Support	253
Self Support	254
Cooperat. Self Support	255
Other Support	256 - 257
Supporting Persons	258
Type of Support	259
Work Conditions	260
Work: Temporal Aspects	261
Seeking Work	262
Type of Work	263 - 264
Work Location	265 - 266
Earnings Per Week	267 - 270
Earnings Per Month	271
Earnings Per Year	272
Miscel. Job Benefits	273
External Support	274
Aid to Disabled	275
Old Age Assistance	276
Social Secur. Disability	277
Social Secur. Old Age	278
Soc. Secur. Retarded Child	279
Unemployment Compensat.	280
Public Welfare	281
Organized Charities	282
Individual Support	283

	Table #
Other Types of Support	284
Degree of Support	285
Welfare in Last 12 Mo.	286
Continuation of Welfare	287
Duration of Welfare	288
Minimum $ Per Week	289
Maximum $ Per Week	290
Form of Welfare	291 - 292
Recipients of Welfare	293
Receipt of Support	294
Continuation of Support	295
Types of Support Rec'd	296
Duration of Support	297
Form of Support	298
Minimum $ Per Week	299
Maximum $ Per Week	300
Recipients of Support	301
Domiciliary Behavior	302 - 305
Leisure Activities	306 - 307
Socializing in the Home	308
General Activity	309
Helps in the Home	310 - 312
Degree Responsible	313
Can be Left Alone	314
Degree of Mobility	315
Modes of Travel	316 - 317
Extent of Travel	318 - 319
Travel Outside USA	320
Leisure Activities	321 - 322
Social Network Extent	323
Rels. Also Dischargees	324
Friends Also Dischargees	325
Soc. Class of Relatives	326 - 327
Soc. Class of Friends	328 - 329
Ages of Relatives	330 - 332
Ages of Friends	333 - 335
Types of Assoc. W. Rels.	336 - 337
Types of Assoc. W. Friends	338 - 339
Has Friends of Opp. Sex	340
Interest in Opposite Sex	341
Neighbors' Reactions	342 - 343
Formal Membership	344
Multiple Membership	345
Type of Membership	346
Degree of Participation	347
Donations to Church	348
Donations to Charities	349
Personal Gifts, etc.	350
Savings Accumulated	351
Amount of Savings	352
Debts and Amounts	353
Domestic Animals, Pets	354
Degree Troublesome	355 - 356
Poor Interpers. Behavior	357 - 358
Property Destruction	359
Property Theft	360
Sex Related Behaviors	361 - 362
Escapes & Avoidances	363 - 364
Exploited by Others	365 - 366
Police Contact Records	367
Total Police Contacts	368
1st or Only Police Contact	369
Second Police Contact	370
Third Police Contact	371
Frequency of Charges	372
Dates of Charges	373
Dispositions of Charges	374
Fines for Charges	375
Incarceration for Charges	376
Type of Prison, etc.	377
State of Occurrence	378

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1.			
NO. OF PRE-DISCHARGE SUBJECTS	325	244	569
2.		(Percentages)	
DATE OF BIRTH			
1878 - 1900	3.39	7.79	5.28
1901 - 1905	1.23	5.74	3.16
1906 - 1910	4.31	7.38	5.62
1911 - 1915	4.62	6.56	5.45
1916 - 1920	8.00	13.11	10.19
1921 - 1925	12.00	15.98	13.71
1926 - 1930	8.62	11.89	10.02
1931 - 1935	17.85	11.07	14.94
1936 - 1940	19.69	15.16	17.75
1941 - 1945	13.54	4.10	9.49
1946 - 1950	5.54	.82	3.51
1951 - 1955	1.23	.41	.88
3.			
BIRTHPLACE (U.S.A. & Foreign)			
Canada	1.2	1.2	1.2
U.S.A.	98.8	98.8	98.8
4.			
BIRTHPLACE (Maine & Other States)			
Maine	96.0	94.3	95.3
New Hampshire	1.2	2.9	1.9
Massachusetts	1.5	1.2	1.4
Conn. & Rhode Island	.3	.8	.5
North East States	.3	.4	.4
South East States	.3	.4	.4
West Coast States	.3	.0	.2

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
4A.			
BIRTHPLACE (Counties in Maine)			
Androscoggin	7.08	9.02	7.91
Aroostook	13.23	13.93	13.53
Cumberland	17.85	10.66	14.76
Franklin	2.15	2.46	2.28
Hancock	2.77	2.46	2.64
Kennebec	9.54	6.97	8.44
Knox	2.46	2.87	2.64
Lincoln	1.85	4.10	2.81
Oxford	4.00	4.10	4.04
Penobscot	9.54	12.70	10.90
Piscataquis	2.77	4.10	3.34
Sagadahoc	1.85	3.69	2.64
Somerset	5.54	1.64	3.87
Waldo	2.15	3.28	2.64
Washington	4.62	5.33	4.92
York	7.38	5.33	6.50
Not Born in Maine	5.23	6.97	5.98
Unknown	0.00	.41	.18
5.			
CIVIL STATUS			
Single	99.4	91.0	95.8
Married	.6	6.1	3.0
Deserted	.0	.4	.2
Separated	.0	.8	.4
Divorced	.0	1.2	.5
Widowed	.0	.4	.2

6.

CHILDREN BORN
(Number Legitimate)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	99.4	92.2	96.3
One	.3	1.6	.9
Two	0.0	1.6	.7
Three	.3	1.6	.9
Four	0.0	.8	.4
Five	0.0	.8	.4
Six	0.0	.4	.2
Seven	0.0	.4	.2
Eight	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nine or More	0.0	.4	.2

7.

CHILDREN BORN
(Number Illegitimate)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	100.0	82.4	92.4
One	0.0	11.9	5.1
Two	0.0	4.9	2.1
Three	0.0	.4	.2
Four	0.0	.4	.2

8.

RELIGION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Atheist	.31	.41	.35
Catholic	33.54	31.15	32.51
Jewish	.31	.41	.35
Protestant,Unspecif.	59.08	62.30	60.46
Prot. Moderate	4.62	4.92	4.75
Prot. Fundamentalist	1.23	.82	1.05
Greek Orthodox	.31	0.00	.18
None	.31	0.00	.18

9.

LEVEL OF SOCIAL FUNCTIONING

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Confined, Home Care	4.3	1.2	3.0
Slight Outside Activ.	2.2	2.0	2.1
Limited Outside	8.3	8.2	8.3
Moderate Outside	1.8	4.1	2.8
Considerable Outside	13.5	9.0	11.6
Considerable to Total	.6	0.0	.4
Normal Treatment	66.8	73.8	69.8
No Information	2.5	1.6	2.1

10.

EMPLOYMENT

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Too Young To Work	23.1	12.7	18.6
I.Q Too Low	6.5	3.7	5.3
Youthful Chores	37.8	41.8	39.5
Youth.Chores, Some $	.9	0.0	.5
Adult, No Employ.	4.3	8.2	6.0
Adult, Occas. Employ.	10.8	17.2	13.5
Adult, Steady Employ.	3.7	9.8	6.3
Adult, Work at Home	.6	.4	.5
Crippled, Disabled	.9	0.0	.5
No Information	11.4	6.1	9.1

11.

GENERAL HEALTH

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Good	69.5	63.5	67.0
Good-Avge.	1.8	2.0	1.9
Average	12.3	21.7	16.3
Avge.-Fair	2.5	2.5	2.5
Fair	11.1	7.0	9.3
Fair-Poor	1.2	2.5	1.8
Poor	.6	.4	.5
No Information	.9	.4	.7

12.

PROPERTY DESTRUCTION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	58.2	82.0	68.4
None-Slight	2.2	.4	1.4
Slight	6.8	5.7	6.3
Slight-Mod.	4.3	3.3	3.9
Moderate	12.0	2.0	7.7
Mod.-Consid.	1.2	1.2	1.2
Considerable	4.9	.8	3.2
Consid.-Extreme	.3	0.0	.2
No Information	10.2	4.5	7.7

13.

THEFT

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	51.4	77.9	62.7
None-Slight	.3	.4	.4
Slight	10.2	7.8	9.1
Slight-Mod.	4.6	3.7	4.2
Moderate	14.8	2.5	9.5
Mod.-Consid.	3.4	.4	2.1
Considerable	7.1	.4	4.2
Consid.-Extreme	.3	.4	.4
No Information	8.0	6.6	7.4

14.

BEHAVIOR TOWARD MOTHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Affect	26.8	27.5	27.1
Average	8.9	8.6	8.8
Troublesome	6.2	3.3	4.9
Trouble & Affect	6.5	7.0	6.7
Physical Violence	.6	0.0	.4
Phys.Viol. & Troub.	1.8	.4	1.2
Phys.V. & Troub. & Aff.	1.8	1.2	1.6
Cruelty	0.0	0.0	0.0
Withdrawal, Timidity	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	.3	0.0	.2
No Information or Separated from Mo.	47.1	52.0	49.2

15.

BEHAVIOR TOWARD FATHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Affect	14.5	19.7	16.7
Average	8.0	7.4	7.7
Troublesome	6.8	2.5	4.9
Trouble & Affect	5.2	5.7	5.4
Physical Violence	0.0	0.0	0.0
Phys.Viol. & Troub.	1.5	0.0	.9
Phys. V. & Troub.& Affect	.3	.8	.5
Cruelty	0.0	0.0	0.0
Withdrawal, Timidity	.6	0.0	.4
Other	.3	0.0	.2
No Information or Separated from Fa.	62.8	63.9	63.3

16.

OVERT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR
(Heterosexual)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Absent, Insignificant	14.5	15.6	14.9
Slight	9.5	10.7	10.0
Slight-Mod.	1.8	4.5	3.0
Moderate	8.6	25.0	15.6
Mod.-Consid.	1.5	6.1	3.5
Considerable	4.3	11.9	7.6
Consid.-Excess.	0.0	2.9	1.2
Excessive	.6	.4	.5
No Information or No Comment	59.1	23.0	43.6

17.

OVERT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR
(Homosexual)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Absent, Insignificant	16.9	29.1	22.1
Slight	2.8	1.6	2.3
Slight-Mod.	1.2	.8	1.1
Moderate	3.4	2.5	3.0
Mod.-Consid.	.9	0.0	.5
Considerable	2.8	0.0	1.6
Consid.-Excess.	.3	.4	.4
Excessive	.3	0.0	.2
No Information or No Comment	71.4	65.6	68.9

18.

OVERT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR
(Other Types)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Absent, Insignificant	14.8	21.7	17.8
Slight	3.7	1.6	2.8
Slight-Mod.	.6	1.2	.9
Moderate	4.3	2.5	3.5
Mod.-Consid.	0.0	.4	.2
Considerable	1.5	1.6	1.6
Consid.-Excess.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Excessive	.9	.4	.7
No Information or No Comment	74.2	70.5	72.6

19.

GENERAL "OBEDIENCE"

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Good	25.2	27.9	26.4
Average	21.2	30.3	25.1
Fair	39.1	34.8	37.3
Poor	11.4	4.5	8.4
Worst	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mixed	.3	0.0	.2
I.Q. Too Low To Qualify	.6	0.0	.4
No Information	2.2	2.5	2.3

20.

ESCAPES
(Types)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Gen'l Rebellion	10.5	5.3	8.3
To Specific Goal	2.8	1.6	2.3
"Roaming the Streets"	8.0	9.0	8.4
School Truancy	5.8	.4	3.5
Sexcapades	0.0	7.0	3.0
Attention-Getting	0.0	.4	.2
Other	2.2	2.5	2.3
No Information or No Comment	70.8	73.8	72.1

21.

ESCAPES
(Frequency)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	58.8	67.6	62.6
Rare	4.0	1.2	2.8
Few	2.2	2.9	2.5
Average	16.0	16.4	16.2
Many	7.18	5.3	6.3
Excessive	0.0	.4	.2
No Information	12.0	6.1	9.5

22.

TYPE OF EDUCATION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	13.5	8.6	11.4
Public	75.7	77.9	76.6
Parochial	4.3	5.7	4.9
Religious Boarding	.6	.4	.5
Private Boarding	.3	0.0	.2
Institutional	.9	2.0	1.4
Tutored	.9	.4	.7
Special Class	.6	0.0	.4
Other	.3	.4	.4
No Information	2.8	4.5	3.5

23.

TYPE OF EDUCATION
(Additional Type)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Additional Type	82.5	84.4	83.3
Public	1.8	2.0	1.9
Parochial	3.4	1.2	2.5
Private Day	0.0	.4	.2
Religious Boarding	.3	2.0	1.1
Institutional	7.1	7.4	7.2
Tutored	.6	.4	.5
Special Class	3.7	1.6	2.8
Other	.6	.4	.5

24.

SCHOOL GRADE
(Actually Achieved)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Pre-First Grade	9.85	4.10	7.38
First Grade	17.85	7.38	13.36
Second	12.92	12.70	12.83
Third	13.85	17.21	15.29
Fourth	8.92	15.16	11.60
Fifth	5.54	13.11	8.79
Sixth	1.85	6.56	3.87
Seventh	.62	3.28	1.76
Eighth	1.85	1.64	1.76
Ninth	0.00	.82	.35
Ungraded Class	.92	0.00	.53
None or Uncertain	25.85	18.03	22.50

25.

SCHOOL GRADE
(Social Grade)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Pre-First Grade	1.85	1.23	1.58
First Grade	7.69	4.51	6.33
Second	4.92	5.74	5.27
Third	10.77	8.61	9.84
Fourth	7.69	10.25	8.79
Fifth	8.31	15.57	11.42
Sixth	6.77	6.97	6.85
Seventh	6.15	8.61	7.21
Eighth	6.15	6.56	6.33
Ninth	.31	1.64	.88
Tenth	0.00	.41	.18
Ungraded	1.54	0.00	.88
None or Uncertain	37.85	29.92	34.45

26.

SCHOOL GRADE
(No. Years Held Back)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	3.7	2.5	3.2
One	8.6	4.9	7.0
Two	9.8	9.4	9.7
Three	9.5	11.1	10.2
Four	8.9	13.9	11.1
Five	5.8	7.0	6.3
Six	3.4	2.9	3.2
Seven	.3	.8	.5
Eight	.6	.8	.7
Nine	0.00	.8	.4
No School or Uncertain	49.2	45.9	47.8

27.

PRIOR I.Q.
(Most Recent or Only)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 - 9	0.00	0.00	0.00
10 - 19	.92	0.00	.53
20 - 29	1.85	.41	1.23
30 - 39	2.77	2.87	2.81
40 - 49	14.46	13.52	14.06
50 - 59	19.08	25.00	21.62
60 - 69	19.69	23.36	21.27
70 - 79	4.62	3.69	4.22
80 - 89	1.23	0.00	.70
90 - 99	.62	0.00	.35
No Formal Record	34.77	31.15	33.22

28.

LANGUAGE(S) LEARNED
(In Childhood)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Speech Capacity	.62	.41	.53
English Only	76.31	77.46	76.80
French Only	2.15	.82	1.58
French 1st, Slight Eng.	4.00	4.92	4.39
French 1st, Some Eng.	8.92	11.48	10.02
Eng. & French Equal	4.62	2.05	3.51
More Eng. Than Fr.	2.46	1.64	2.11
Eng. & Lithuanian	.31	0.00	.18
Italian & Eng.	.62	.82	.70
Finnish & Eng.	0.00	.41	.18

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
29.			
AGE AT IDENTIFICATION (Formally Identified as Retarded)			
Birth - 1 Month	2.15	2.46	2.28
2 - 6 Months	3.69	1.64	2.81
7 - 12 Months	.62	0.00	.35
Birth - 1 Year	2.85	1.64	1.76
1 - 3 Years	14.77	9.02	12.31
4 - 5 Years	9.54	3.69	7.03
6 - 9 Years	16.00	16.39	16.17
10 - 12 Years	18.46	15.57	17.22
13 - 15 Years	16.31	16.39	16.34
16 - 19 Years	6.15	12.30	8.79
20 Plus	1.23	13.93	6.68
Other Conditions	.31	0.00	.18
No Info. Or Unclear	8.92	6.97	8.08
30.			
IDENT. AS RETARDED BY:			
Parents	18.5	10.7	15.1
Medical Doctors	6.2	3.7	5.1
School	15.4	11.1	13.5
Health & Welfare Dept.	18.8	26.2	22.0
Correctional Instit.	9.5	20.9	14.4
Mental Instit.	1.8	1.6	1.8
Orphanage	1.5	1.6	1.6
Courts	7.1	1.2	4.6
Civil Authorities	2.2	5.7	3.7
Other	.9	2.9	1.8
No Info. Or Unclear	18.2	14.3	16.5

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
31.			
IDENT. AS RETARDED BY: (Add'l Identifiers)			
Parents	1.5	2.0	1.8
Medical Doctors	5.2	3.3	4.4
School	1.8	1.2	1.6
Health & Welfare Dept.	.3	2.0	1.1
Correctional Instit.	.6	.4	.5
Orphanage	.3	0.0	.2
Courts	.3	0.0	.2
Civil Authorities	.6	.8	.7
Other	.3	.4	.4
No Add'l Identifiers	88.9	89.8	89.3
32.			
PARENTAL DENIAL (Of Retardation)			
Parents Absent, etc.	9.2	11.1	10.0
Retardation Denied	7.4	10.7	8.8
Retardation Affirmed	36.6	27.0	32.5
Partial Denial	3.1	5.7	4.2
No Info., Or Unclear	43.7	45.5	44.5
33.			
NEGATIVE SOCIAL HIST. (Institutions, etc.)			
None	70.8	63.5	67.7
Mental Instit.	2.5	1.6	2.1
Arrests, etc.	8.0	1.2	5.1
Reform. School	14.2	14.3	14.2
Reformatory	2.5	16.0	8.3
Prison	.3	0.0	.2
Pineland, prior	.6	.4	.5
Other	.6	1.2	.9
No Information	.6	1.6	1.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
34.			
NEGATIVE SOCIAL HIST. (Additional)			
None	94.5	95.5	94.9
Mental Instit.	.3	.4	.4
Arrests, etc.	3.1	.4	1.9
Reform School	1.2	.8	1.1
Reformatory	.9	2.0	1.4
Pineland, prior	0.0	.8	.4
35.			
SOC. STRUCTURE OF HOME (Following Birth)			
Both Parents	86.15	87.30	86.64
Mother Alone	10.77	9.02	10.02
Father Alone	.62	.41	.53
Mo. & Com. Law Mate	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	2.46	2.87	2.64
36.			
SOC. STRUCTURE OF HOME (At One Year Old)			
Both Parents	79.69	81.15	80.30
Mo. & Step Fa.	.92	.82	.88
Mother Alone	5.85	2.87	4.57
Father Alone	0.00	.82	.35
Close Relatives	.62	1.23	.88
Adoptive Parents	.31	.41	.35
Foster Home	3.38	2.87	3.16
Boarding Home	.31	.41	.35
Orphanage	1.54	1.23	1.41
Mo. & Com.Law Mate	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	7.38	7.79	7.56

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
37.			
SOC. STRUCTURE OF HOME (On Adm. to Pineland)			
Both Parents	29.23	10.25	21.09
Mo. & Step Fa.	5.85	2.46	4.39
Fa. & Step Mo.	2.15	1.23	1.76
Mo. Alone	9.23	5.74	7.73
Fa. Alone	2.15	2.46	2.28
Close Relatives	3.38	2.46	2.99
Distant Relatives	0.00	.41	.18
Adoptive Parents	.92	.82	.88
Foster Parents	25.85	29.10	27.24
Boarding Home	1.23	2.87	1.93
Orphanage	3.38	3.69	3.51
Reform School	7.69	12.30	9.67
Reformatory	3.08	15.16	8.26
Jail	.31	0.00	.18
Mental Hosp.	1.23	1.64	1.41
Poor Farm	.92	2.46	1.58
Solo, "on own"	.92	3.69	2.11
Self w. Spouse	.31	.82	.53
Self w. Com.Law Mate	.31	0.00	.18
Nursing Home	0.00	.82	.35
Mo. & Com.Law Mate	.31	.41	.35
Hospital (Phys.)	.31	0.00	.18
Friends, etc.	0.00	.41	.18
O. Tr. Sch. for Retard.	.62	.41	.53
Self w. Children	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	.62	0.00	.35
38.			
OF LEGITIMATE BIRTH			
Legitimate	77.8	79.1	78.4
Illegitimate	11.1	9.4	10.4
Probably Legit.	9.2	8.6	9.0
Probably Illegit.	1.8	1.6	1.8
No Information	0.0	1.2	.5

39.

SEPARATION OF PARENTS
(Before Adm. of
Patient to Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Information	3.38	3.69	3.51
Not Separated	39.69	27.46	34.45
Mo. & Fa. Dead	.31	2.05	1.05
Mother Dead	7.38	11.07	8.96
Mo. Died in Childbirth	.62	.41	.53
Mo. Died When Pt. Adult	0.00	.41	.18
Father Dead	11.08	15.16	12.83
Born Posthumously	.31	0.00	.18
Father Suicide	.62	0.00	.35
Fa. Died When Pt. Adult	.62	.82	.70
Never Married	10.77	9.02	10.02
Divorced	10.77	7.79	9.49
Separated	3.08	3.69	3.34
Sep., Later Reunited	.31	.41	.35
Mar. Annulled	0.00	.41	.18
Com. Law Mar. Ended	.31	.41	.35
Not Sep. Until Pt. Adult	.31	.82	.53
Mother Deserted	3.08	4.51	3.69
Mother Vagrant	0.00	.41	.18
Mother Hospitalized	.31	0.00	.18
Mo. in Mental Hosp.	.62	1.64	1.05
Mother Jailed	.92	0.00	.53
Father Deserted	3.08	5.74	4.22
Father Vagrant	.31	.82	.53
Father Hospitalized	.31	.82	.53
Father Jailed	.92	1.23	1.05
Fa. in Armed Forces	.31	0.00	.18
Other Types	.62	1.23	.89

40.

NO. OF STRUCTURAL BREAKS
(Pt's Home, Ages 0-19)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Unknown	.3	1.6	.9
None Recorded	27.1	13.9	21.4
One	20.3	25.4	22.5
Two	23.1	17.2	20.6
Three	10.8	16.4	13.2
Four	7.4	9.4	8.3
Five	3.1	8.6	5.4
Six	3.1	3.3	3.2
Seven	1.8	2.5	2.1
Eight	2.2	.8	1.6
Nine	.6	.8	.7
Ten or More	.3	0.0	.2

40A.

ADMISSION TO PINELAND

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
5 - 9 Years Old	16.0	5.7	11.6
10 - 14 " "	39.4	26.6	33.9
15 - 19 " "	34.5	37.7	35.9
20 Years & Over	10.2	29.9	18.6

41.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 0-1 YR. OLD

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	82.5	81.6	82.1
One Break	8.3	6.6	7.6
Two Breaks	.9	.4	.7
Unknown	4.6	6.1	5.3
In Broader Age Group	3.7	5.3	4.4

41A.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 1-4 YRS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	63.7	67.2	65.2
One Break	15.7	10.2	13.4
Two Breaks	5.5	5.3	5.4
Three Breaks	0.0	.4	.2
Four Breaks	.3	1.2	.7
Unknown	5.5	6.1	5.8
In Broader Age Group	9.2	9.4	9.3

41B.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 5-9 YRS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	56.3	53.7	55.2
One Break	12.9	18.0	15.1
Two	11.1	5.3	8.6
Three	2.5	4.5	3.3
Four	.6	1.2	.9
Five	.6	.4	.5
Six	0.0	.4	.2
Seven or More	.3	0.0	.2
Unknown	5.8	7.4	6.5
In Broader Age Group	9.8	9.0	9.5

41C.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 10-14 YRS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Already At Pineland	16.0	5.7	11.6
None	39.1	40.6	39.7
One Break	19.1	23.0	20.7
Two	9.5	12.3	10.7
Three	4.9	3.3	4.2
Four	1.5	1.2	1.4
Five	.3	.4	.4
Six	0.0	.4	.2
Seven or More	.3	0.0	.2
Unknown	3.4	5.7	4.4
In Broader Age Group	5.8	7.4	6.5

41D.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 15-19 YRS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Already at Pineland	55.4	32.4	45.5
None	24.9	25.4	25.1
One	8.9	20.9	14.1
Two	4.0	7.8	5.6
Three	.3	4.9	2.3
Four	0.0	2.0	.9
Five	.3	.4	.4
Six	.3	0.0	.2
Seven or More	.3	0.0	.2
Unknown	2.5	3.7	3.0
In Broader Age Group	3.1	2.5	2.8

41E.

STRUCT. BREAKS: 20+ YRS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Already At Pineland	89.8	70.1	81.4
None	2.5	9.8	5.6
One	3.7	4.9	4.2
Two	1.2	6.1	3.3
Three	1.2	3.7	2.3
Four	0.0	1.6	.7
Five	.3	.8	.5
Six	0.0	.4	.2
Seven or More	.3	.8	.5
Unknown	.6	1.6	1.1
In Broader Age Group	.3	0.0	.2

NOTE: Broader Age Groups are cited in Tables 41 through 41C. In some cases it was not possible to locate the structural breaks certainly within one of the above age groups (0-1, 1-4, 5-9 etc.). The breaks could however be located in broader age groups (eg. 0-4, 1-9, 0-9 etc.) and provided information for nine additional tables. As the cases involved are quite limited in number, these tables are not included here.

42.

NO. OF SIBS IN SIBSHIP
(Including Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	6.15	2.87	4.75
Two	12.00	7.38	10.02
Three	13.85	9.84	12.13
Four	9.85	11.48	10.54
Five	10.77	18.85	14.24
Six	11.38	9.02	10.37
Seven	6.77	11.89	8.96
Eight	8.92	8.61	8.79
Nine	4.62	4.10	4.39
Ten	5.85	6.15	5.98
Eleven	2.15	2.05	2.11
Twelve	2.15	1.64	1.93
Thirteen	.92	.82	.88
Fourteen	.31	1.64	.88
Fifteen	.31	.41	.35
Sixteen	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	4.00	2.87	3.51

43.

NO. MALES IN SIBSHIP
(Incl. Male Patients)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	0.0	9.4	4.0
One	21.8	25.0	23.2
Two	26.8	18.9	23.4
Three	17.5	18.4	17.9
Four	14.8	7.8	11.8
Five	8.3	5.7	7.2
Six	4.6	2.5	3.7
Seven	2.5	0.0	1.4
Eight	.3	.8	.5
Nine or More	.9	.8	.9
No Info. or Unclear	2.5	10.7	6.0

44.

NO. FEMALES IN SIBSHIP
(Incl. Fem. Patients)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	16.0	0.0	9.1
One	23.1	18.0	20.9
Two	16.6	21.7	18.8
Three	13.5	21.7	17.0
Four	11.4	13.5	12.3
Five	4.0	10.2	6.7
Six	3.1	5.7	4.2
Seven	1.2	2.9	1.9
Eight	1.5	1.6	1.6
Nine or More	.6	.8	.7
No Info. or Unclear	8.9	3.7	6.7

45.

BIRTH ORDER OF PT.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Only Child	7.38	3.28	5.62
First	19.08	14.75	17.22
Second	14.46	15.98	15.11
Middle Range	20.92	28.28	24.08
Next to Last	10.77	10.25	10.54
Last	21.23	19.26	20.39
Situation Confused	1.23	2.05	1.58
No Information	4.92	6.15	5.45

46.

ONE OF TWINS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Yes	1.5	2.9	2.1
Yes - Questionable	.6	0.0	.4
Yes - Other Tw. Dead	.3	.4	.4
Uncertain	.6	.8	.7
No	96.9	95.9	96.5

47.

SOC. MOD. OF SIB ORDER
(Through Structural Breaks)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Modified	19.1	25.8	22.0
Partially Modified	15.4	20.5	17.6
Prob. Not Modified	2.8	2.0	2.5
Not Modified	57.5	46.3	52.7
No Information	5.2	5.3	5.3

48.

ETHNICITY OF MOTHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Yankee	59.69	65.47	62.21
French Canadian	20.31	20.90	20.56
Anglo Canadian	3.08	1.64	2.46
American Mixture	8.31	3.28	6.15
Irish	.62	1.64	1.05
Irish American	.92	.41	.70
Finnish	.31	.41	.35
American Indian	.31	1.23	.70
Lithuanian	.31	0.00	.18
Fr. Can. & Amerind	0.00	.41	.18
Jewish Slavic	0.00	.41	.18
Jewish American	0.00	.41	.18
Italian	.62	1.23	.88
Italian American	0.00	.41	.18
German	.31	0.00	.18
American Negro	.31	0.00	.18
Southern White	0.00	.41	.18
Greek American	.31	0.00	.18
Yankee & Fr. Can.	1.23	0.00	.70
Yankee & Amerind	.31	0.00	.18
No Information	3.08	1.64	2.46

49.

ETHNICITY OF FATHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Yankee	55.69	63.93	59.23
French Canadian	17.54	18.44	17.93
Anglo Canadian	5.23	4.10	4.75
American Mixture	6.46	2.05	4.57
Irish	.92	0.00	.53
Irish Canadian	0.00	.41	.18
Irish American	.31	.82	.53
Finnish	.31	.41	.35
American Indian	.31	.82	.53
Norwegian	.62	0.00	.35
Norwegian American	0.00	.41	.18
So. Harpswell Mixture	.62	0.00	.35
Lithuanian	.31	0.00	.18
Greek	.31	0.00	.18
Scotch	.31	0.00	.18
Fr. Can. & Amerind	.31	.41	.35
Jewish Slavic	0.00	.41	.18
Jewish American	.31	0.00	.18
Scotch & Amerind	0.00	.41	.18
Italian	.92	1.23	1.05
Italian American	.31	0.00	.18
English	.31	0.00	.18
Southern White	.31	0.00	.18
Yankee & Fr. Can.	.62	0.00	.35
Swedish	0.00	.41	.18
Syrian	.31	0.00	.18
No Information	7.69	5.74	6.85

50.

RACE OF MOTHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
White	98.2	98.0	98.1
Negro	.3	0.0	.2
American Indian	.3	1.2	.7
White & Amerind	.6	.8	.7
No Information	.6	0.0	.4

51.

RACE OF FATHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
White	98.5	97.5	98.1
American Indian	.3	.8	.5
White & Amerind	.3	1.2	.7
So. Harpswell Mixture	.6	0.0	.4
No Information	.3	.4	.4

52.

SOCIAL CLASS OF MOTHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper Middle	.6	0.0	.4
Middle	4.0	2.0	3.2
Lower Middle	7.7	3.3	5.8
Lower	34.8	28.7	32.2
Lower to Nadir	43.4	54.5	48.2
Nadir	5.5	8.2	6.7
No Information	4.0	3.3	3.7

53.

MOTHER, RUR.-URBAN TYPE

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Maritime	.9	.8	.9
Rural	38.2	44.3	40.8
Village	4.9	7.4	6.0
Town	12.3	7.4	10.2
Village & Town	.6	0.0	.4
Rural & Urban	14.8	11.9	13.5
Urban	21.8	20.5	21.3
No Information	6.5	7.8	7.0

54.

SOCIAL CLASS OF FATHER

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper Middle	.6	.4	.5
Middle	2.8	1.6	2.3
Lower Middle	5.8	2.9	4.6
Lower	40.0	31.1	36.2
Lower to Nadir	36.6	48.0	41.5
Nadir	2.8	5.7	4.0
Other (Unclassifiable)	0.0	.4	.2
No Information	11.4	9.8	10.7

55.

FATHER, RUR.-URBAN TYPE

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Maritime	1.8	.8	1.4
Rural & Maritime	.6	0.0	.4
Rural	36.0	39.3	37.4
Village	4.0	7.4	5.4
Town	11.7	7.4	9.8
Village & Town	.3	0.0	.2
Rural & Urban	12.3	10.7	11.6
Urban	22.5	18.4	20.7
No Information	10.8	16.0	13.0

56.

OTHER ADULTS IN HOME

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Step Mother	1.8	1.2	1.6
Step Father	10.5	6.1	8.6
Foster Mother	20.9	24.6	22.5
Sibling(s)	.9	4.5	2.5
Adult Relative(s)	5.2	3.7	4.6
Adoptive Parent	.9	2.0	1.4
"Orphanage" Personnel	2.8	5.3	3.9
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0
None (or No Info.)	56.9	52.5	55.0

57.

SOCIAL CLASS OF OTHER
(In Table 56.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper Middle	.3	0.0	.2
Middle	1.5	2.0	1.8
Lower Middle	7.4	8.6	7.9
Lower	20.6	20.5	20.6
Lower to Nadir	4.3	7.4	5.6
Nadir	.9	.8	.9
None (or No Info.)	64.9	60.7	63.1

58.

OTHER, RUR.-URBAN TYPE
(In Table 56.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Rural	14.2	12.7	13.5
Village	3.4	4.9	4.0
Town	4.3	5.3	4.7
Village & Town	.3	0.0	.2
Rural & Urban	3.7	2.5	3.2
Urban	8.3	11.9	9.8
None (or No Info.)	65.8	62.7	64.5

59.

MOTHER'S EDUCATION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 to 4th Grade	16.31	22.95	19.16
4th to 8th Grade	32.62	35.66	33.92
Grammar Sch. Complete	12.62	6.97	10.19
Hi. School Incomplete	8.31	2.87	5.98
Hi. School Complete	5.54	4.92	5.27
Trade Sch., Jr. Col. etc.	1.23	0.00	.70
College Incomplete	.62	0.00	.35
College Complete	.92	0.00	.53
No Information	21.85	26.64	23.90

60.

FATHER'S EDUCATION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 to 4th Grade	14.77	23.77	18.63
4th to 8th Grade	17.54	20.08	18.63
Grammar Sch. Complete	12.62	5.74	9.67
Hi. School Incomplete	4.31	2.46	3.51
Hi. School Complete	3.38	1.64	2.64
Trade Sch., Jr. Col. etc.	.31	.41	.35
College Complete	.92	.41	.70
Post-Grad. Incomplete	.31	0.00	.18
Post-Grad. Complete	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	45.85	45.08	45.52

61.

MOTHER'S RELIGION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	2.2	1.2	1.8
Catholic	30.5	30.7	30.6
Jewish	0.0	.8	.4
Protestant, Unspecif.	60.6	62.7	61.5
Prot. Moderate	.9	.4	.7
Prot. Fundamentalist	.6	.4	.5
Other Xtian Sect	.3	0.0	.2
No Information	4.9	3.7	4.4

62.

FATHER'S RELIGION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	1.2	.8	1.1
Catholic	26.2	23.4	25.0
Jewish	.3	.4	.4
Protestant, Unspecif.	56.0	60.7	58.0
Prot. Moderate	.6	.8	.7
Prot. Fundamentalist	.6	.4	.5
Other Xtian Sect	.6	.4	.5
No Information	14.5	13.1	13.9

63.

MOTHER'S ATTITUDE
(Toward Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Affect	7.7	7.4	7.6
"Average", Undisting.	50.2	52.9	51.3
Rejection	21.5	20.1	20.9
Extreme Rejection	.3	0.0	.2
Irresponsible & Accept.	4.9	3.3	4.2
Disorganized, Deranged	3.1	2.5	2.8
Other Attitudes	.3	0.0	.2
No Information	12.0	13.9	12.8

64.

MOTHER'S ATTITUDE
(In Addition to Table 63.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Overindulgence	2.2	1.2	1.8
Mild Overindulgence	.3	0.0	.2
Affect	.9	.4	.7
"Average", Undisting.	2.5	3.7	3.0
Rejection	13.5	11.1	12.5
Irresponsible & Accept.	3.4	2.9	3.2
Disorganized, Deranged	6.2	7.8	6.9
Other Attitudes	.9	.4	.7
No Additional Att.	70.2	72.5	71.2

65.

FATHER'S ATTITUDE
(Toward Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Affect	4.3	2.9	3.7
"Average", Undisting.	34.8	37.3	35.9
Rejection	27.4	26.2	26.9
Extreme Rejection	.6	0.0	.4
Physical Abuse	.3	.8	.5
Irresponsible & Accept	1.8	2.9	2.3
Disorganized, Deranged	2.5	0.0	1.4
No Information	28.3	29.9	29.0

66.

FATHER'S ATTITUDE
(In Addition to Table 65.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Overindulgence	.3	.4	.4
Affect	0.0	.4	.2
"Average", Undisting.	1.5	2.5	1.9
Rejection	8.9	8.6	8.8
Physical Abuse	.9	.4	.7
Irresponsible & Accept.	.3	.4	.4
Disorganized, Deranged	1.8	4.5	3.0
Other Attitudes	.9	.4	.7
No Additional Att.	85.2	82.4	84.0

67.

MOTHER'S MENTAL HEALTH

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	.3	0.0	.2
Good	9.5	7.8	8.8
Average	19.7	16.8	18.5
Fair	36.0	36.1	36.0
Poor	21.8	28.7	24.8
Worse	.9	.8	.9
Worst	1.8	.4	1.2
No Information	9.8	9.4	9.7

68.

FATHER'S MENTAL HEALTH

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	.3	0.0	.2
Good	8.9	6.6	7.9
Average	19.7	13.5	17.0
Fair	28.3	30.3	29.2
Poor	19.7	24.6	21.8
Worse	.3	.4	.4
Worst	.3	.4	.4
No Information	22.5	24.2	23.2

69.

MO'S INSTITUT. HISTORY

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Arrests, Local Jail etc.	1.5	.8	1.2
Reform School	.6	1.6	1.1
Reformatory	7.4	5.7	6.7
Mental Hospital	2.5	5.3	3.7
Pineland	1.5	2.0	1.8
T.B. Sanitarium	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	.3	0.0	.2
None in Avail. Records	86.2	84.4	85.4

70.

FA'S INSTITUT. HISTORY

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Arrests, Local Jail etc.	6.2	2.9	4.7
Reform School	.9	.4	.7
Reformatory	.9	1.2	1.1
Prison	2.2	1.6	1.9
Mental Hospital	0.0	1.6	.7
Pineland	0.0	.4	.2
T.B. Sanitarium	.6	.8	.7
Other	.3	0.0	.2
None in Avail. Records	88.9	91.0	89.8

71.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Relatives of Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Male Sib	19.4	28.3	23.2
Female Sib	15.1	18.9	16.7
Close Male Relative	4.0	3.3	3.7
Close Female Relative	4.0	3.3	3.7
Daughter	0.0	2.5	1.1
Son	0.0	.4	.2
Less Close Relative	3.7	2.9	3.3
Step Mo or Step Fa	1.2	.4	.9
Spouse	0.0	.4	.2
None in Avail. Records	52.6	39.8	47.1

72.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Inst's for Table 71.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Arrests, Local Jail etc.	1.2	1.6	1.4
Reform School	5.2	4.9	5.1
Reformatory	3.4	3.3	3.3
Prison	1.8	3.3	2.5
Mental Hospital	6.8	7.4	7.0
Pineland	27.4	38.5	32.2
T.B. Sanitarium	.9	.8	.9
Other	.6	.4	.5
None in Avail. Records	52.6	39.8	47.1

73.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Add'l Rels. of Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Male Sib	9.5	9.8	9.7
Female Sib	8.6	19.7	13.4
Close Male Relative	2.5	1.2	1.9
Close Female Relative	.9	2.5	1.6
Son	0.0	1.6	.7
Less Close Relative	3.4	2.9	3.2
Step Mo or Step Fa	.3	0.0	.2
Spouse	0.0	.4	.2
None in Avail. Records	74.8	61.9	69.2

74.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Inst's for Table 73.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Arrests, Local Jail etc.	1.2	.8	1.1
Reform School	3.4	3.7	3.5
Reformatory	.6	2.9	1.6
Prison	.6	1.2	.9
Mental Hospital	2.2	2.9	2.5
Pineland	16.9	26.2	20.9
T.B. Sanitarium	0.0	.4	.2
Other	.3	0.0	.2
None in Avail. Records	74.8	61.9	69.2

75.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Add'l Rels. of Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Male Sib	2.8	5.7	4.0
Female Sib	3.4	9.4	6.0
Close Male Relative	2.2	2.0	2.1
Close Female Relative	1.5	1.2	1.4
Son	0.0	.4	.2
Less Close Relative	2.8	4.5	3.5
None in Avail. Records	87.4	76.6	82.8

76.

OTHERS' INSTITUT. HIST.
(Inst's for Table 75.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Arrests, Local Jail etc.	.6	1.2	.9
Reform School	.9	1.6	1.2
Reformatory	0.0	1.2	.5
Prison	.3	.4	.4
Mental Hospital	.6	2.0	1.2
Pineland	10.2	16.0	12.7
T.B. Sanitarium	0.0	.4	.2
Other	0.0	.4	.2
None in Avail. Records	87.4	76.6	82.8

77.

TYPE OF ADMISSION
(Of Pt. to Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Voluntary	3.38	1.64	2.64
Probate Court	66.77	88.11	75.92
Municipal Court	24.92	6.15	16.87
Superior Court	.62	0.00	.35
Out of State Transfer	.31	.41	.35
Reform School Transfer	1.85	.82	1.41
Reformatory Transfer	.92	1.23	1.05
Mental Hosp. Transfer	1.23	1.64	1.41

78.

INITIATORS OF ADMISSION
(Of Pt. to Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Both Parents	11.08	5.33	8.61
Mother	99.54	5.74	7.91
Father	4.62	2.05	3.51
Step Mother	0.00	0.00	0.00
Step Father	0.00	.41	.18
Other Relatives	.92	2.87	1.76
Adoptive Parents	.62	.82	.70
Foster Home	1.23	0.00	.70
Other Private Citizen	1.54	1.23	1.41
Health & Welfare Dept.	27.69	34.84	30.76
Other State Dept.	.31	0.00	.18
Civil Authorities	11.38	13.93	12.48
Other Organization	.31	0.00	.18
Courts, Law Enforce.	12.69	.41	9.14
Medical Doctor	.31	0.00	.18
School Authorities	.62	.41	.53
Reform School	7.69	12.30	9.67
Reformatory	3.08	15.98	8.61
Mental Hospital	1.54	1.23	1.41
Orphanage	.92	2.05	1.41
O. Tr. Sch. for Retard.	.62	.41	.53
Uncertain	.31	0.00	.18

79.

INITIATORS OF ADMISSION
(Add'l, If More Than 1)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Both Parents	1.23	0.00	.70
Mother	1.54	1.64	1.58
Father	.31	1.64	.88
Step Mother	1.23	.82	1.05
Step Father	2.46	0.00	1.41
Other Relatives	.92	1.23	1.05
Foster Home	.62	.82	.70
Other Private Citizen	1.54	0.00	.88
Health & Welfare Dept.	1.85	1.23	1.58
Civil Authorities	5.54	4.92	5.27
Other Organization	1.54	0.00	.88
Courts, Law Enforce.	4.62	.82	2.99
Medical Doctor	.31	0.00	.18
No Addit'l Initiator	76.31	86.89	80.84

80.

OVERT CAUSE FOR ADMISS.
(Of Pt. to Fineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
General, Unclear	0.00	.41	.18
Parents Ill	.31	0.00	.18
Interstate Transfer	.62	0.00	.35
For Special Educ.	3.08	2.46	2.81
For Spec. Phys. Care	.31	.41	.35
For Observation	.31	0.00	.18
Burden to Town	.31	0.00	.18
Troublesome in Home	5.54	.82	3.51
Poor Home Conditions	.31	.41	.35
Burden to Parents	.31	0.00	.18
Defective Delinquent	16.62	3.28	10.90
Single Offense	1.85	.41	1.23
Multiple Offenses	1.85	.41	1.23
Moderate Offense	.31	0.00	.18
Troublesome in Commun.	1.85	3.69	2.64
"Needs Institut. Care"	29.85	36.48	32.69
"Retarded"	35.69	50.41	42.00
Fear of Retarded	0.00	.41	.18
Uncertain	.92	.41	.70

81.

OVERT CAUSE FOR ADMISS.
(Add'l, If More Than 1)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
General, Unclear	0.00	1.23	.53
Death of Parents	.31	.41	.35
Parents Ill	.92	1.23	1.05
Overage for Child Welf.	.62	.41	.53
Overage, C. Instit.	.31	0.00	.18
Interstate Transfer	0.00	.41	.18
For Special Educ.	5.23	2.46	4.04
To Learn a Trade	1.23	.41	.88
For Spec. Phys. Care	1.85	.82	1.41
O. Unusual Reason	.62	0.00	.35
Burden to Town	.31	1.23	.70
Unwanted in Home	.31	.41	.35
Troublesome in Home	7.08	4.51	5.98
Poor Home Conditions	.62	2.46	1.41
Burden to Parents	1.85	0.00	1.05
Burden to Relatives	0.00	.41	.18
School Problem	.92	0.00	.53
Single Offense	.31	.82	.53
Multiple Offenses	3.69	.41	2.28
Slight Offense	.62	0.00	.35
Moderate Offense	.62	0.00	.35
Severe Offense	.31	0.00	.18
Troublesome in Commun.	12.92	12.70	12.83
Emotionally Disturbed	0.00	.41	.18
"Needs Institut. Care"	5.23	6.56	5.80
"Retarded"	5.23	6.15	5.62
Fear of Retarded	.31	0.00	.18
No Additional Cause	48.62	56.56	52.02

5

82.

TRUE CAUSE FOR ADMISS.
(Of Pt. to Fineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
General, Unclear	0.00	.41	.18
Parents Ill	.31	0.00	.18
Interstate Transfer	.62	0.00	.35
For Special Educ.	3.69	3.28	3.51
To Learn a Trade	.31	0.00	.18
Advised by M.D.	.92	0.00	.53
For Spec. Phys. Care	.31	.41	.35
For Observation	.31	0.00	.18
O. Unusual Reason	.31	0.00	.18
Burden to Town	4.00	3.69	3.87
Town Coercion	.92	1.23	1.05
Burden to State	.62	0.00	.35
Hlth & Welf Disposal	2.15	11.07	5.98
H. & W. Coercion	.62	0.00	.35
Unwanted in Home	2.46	3.28	2.81
Troublesome in Home	6.46	1.64	4.39
Poor Home Conditions	.62	.41	.53
Burden to Parents	1.23	.41	.88
Burden to Relatives	.31	.41	.35
Defective Delinquent	12.00	.82	7.21
Single Offense	2.46	0.00	1.41
Multiple Offense	2.15	.41	1.41
Slight Offense	0.00	.41	.18
Moderate Offense	.62	0.00	.35
False Charges	1.23	1.64	1.41
Troublesome in Commun.	2.15	3.28	2.64
Emotionally Disturbed	.31	.41	.35
"Needs Institut. Care"	20.92	25.00	22.67
"Retarded"	28.92	39.34	33.39
Fear of Retarded	.62	0.00	.35
Ashamed of Retarded	.31	0.00	.18
Uncertain	2.15	2.46	2.29

83.

TRUE CAUSE FOR ADMISS.
(Add'l, If More Than 1)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
General, Unclear	.31	1.23	.70
Death of Parents	.31	.82	.53
Parents Ill	.92	1.64	1.23
Overage for Child Welf.	.62	.41	.53
Overage, O. Instit.	.31	0.00	.18
Interstate Transfer	0.00	.41	.18
For Special Educ.	4.00	.82	2.64
To Learn a Trade	1.23	0.00	.70
For Spec. Phys. Care	2.46	.41	1.58
O. Unusual Reason	.92	0.00	.53
Burden to Town	4.31	5.74	4.92
Burden to State	.62	0.00	.35
Hlth & Welf Disposal	3.08	2.87	2.99
Unwanted in Home	3.38	2.46	2.99
Troublesome in Home	7.38	2.87	5.45
Poor Home Conditions	1.23	2.05	1.58
Burden to Parents	2.15	.41	1.41
Burden to Relatives	.31	.41	.35
School Problem	.62	0.00	.35
Single Offense	0.00	1.23	.53
Multiple Offense	3.69	.41	2.28
Slight Offense	.62	0.00	.35
Moderate Offense	.62	0.00	.35
Severe Offense	.31	0.00	.18
Troublesome in Commun.	12.62	10.25	11.60
Emotionally Disturbed	.31	.41	.35
"Needs Institut. Care"	3.69	5.33	4.39
"Retarded"	5.23	5.33	5.27
Fear of Retarded	.31	0.00	.18
Ashamed of Retarded	0.00	.41	.18
Uncertain	.62	1.64	1.06
No Additional Cause	37.85	52.46	44.11

84.

AGE AT ADMISSION
(To Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Five Years	1.23	.41	.88
Six	2.77	0.00	1.58
Seven	1.85	1.23	1.58
Eight	3.69	1.23	2.64
Nine	6.15	2.87	4.75
Ten	4.92	4.51	4.75
Eleven	6.15	4.10	5.27
Twelve	8.92	4.51	7.03
Thirteen	10.15	4.92	7.91
Fourteen	9.54	9.02	9.31
Fifteen	12.00	6.15	9.49
Sixteen	11.38	11.48	11.42
Seventeen	6.15	10.25	7.91
Eighteen	3.38	3.69	3.51
Nineteen	1.85	3328	2.46
Twenty	.62	9.43	4.39
Twenty-One	.62	3.69	1.93
Twenty-Two	.92	1.64	1.23
Twenty-Three	1.23	.41	.88
Twenty-Four	.92	2.05	1.41
25 Through 29	2.15	6.15	3.87
30 Through 34	1.85	4.51	2.99
35 Through 39	.92	3.28	1.93
40 Through 44	.31	.41	.35
45 Through 49	.31	0.00	.18
50 Through 54	0.00	.82	.35

85.

AGE AT DISCHARGE
(From Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Five Years	0.00	0.00	0.00
Six	.31	0.00	.18
Seven	.31	.41	.35
Eight	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nine	.92	0.00	.53
Ten	1.54	0.00	.88
Eleven	2.46	.82	1.76
Twelve	.62	.41	.53
Thirteen	1.23	0.00	.70
Fourteen	2.15	.41	1.41
Fifteen	2.77	.82	1.93
Sixteen	4.00	.41	2.46
Seventeen	2.15	2.05	2.11
Eighteen	4.92	2.46	3.87
Nineteen	5.23	2.05	3.87
Twenty	6.46	1.64	4.39
Twenty-One	6.15	5.33	5.80
Twenty-Two	4.00	2.05	3.16
Twenty-Three	3.38	2.05	2.81
Twenty-Four	3.38	4.92	4.04
25 Through 29	12.92	12.70	12.83
30 Through 34	8.31	14.75	11.07
35 Through 39	9.85	13.11	11.25
40 Through 44	6.15	8.20	7.03
45 Through 49	3.69	9.43	6.15
50 Through 54	3.08	5.33	4.04
55 Through 59	.62	3.69	1.93
60 Through 64	.92	.82	.88
65 Through 69	.92	4.51	2.46
70 Plus	1.54	1.64	1.58

86.

AGE AT FIRST VISIT
(To Community)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Six Years	.31	0.00	.18
Seven	.31	.41	.35
Eight	.62	.41	.53
Nine	1.54	.41	1.05
Ten	1.54	.82	1.23
Eleven	3.69	0.00	2.11
Twelve	1.23	.41	.88
Thirteen	.62	.41	.53
Fourteen	2.15	.41	1.41
Fifteen	2.77	.82	1.93
Sixteen	3.38	1.23	2.46
Seventeen	5.54	4.10	4.92
Eighteen	8.31	1.64	5.45
Nineteen	8.92	4.92	7.21
Twenty	4.92	3.69	4.39
Twenty-One	6.46	4.10	5.45
Twenty-Two	4.62	4.92	4.75
Twenty-Three	3.38	2.05	2.81
Twenty-Four	1.23	2.46	1.76
25 Through 29	8.62	15.16	11.42
30 Through 34	11.08	18.44	14.24
35 Through 39	8.00	9.43	8.61
40 Through 44	3.08	6.56	4.57
45 Through 49	3.38	4.10	3.69
50 Through 54	.62	4.51	2.28
55 Through 59	.92	2.05	1.41
60 Through 64	.31	.82	.53
65 Through 69	1.23	4.51	2.64
70 Plus	1.23	1.23	1.23

87.

YEAR OF ADMISSION
(To Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1908 - 1909	.92	.41	.70
1910 - 1914	.62	3.69	1.93
1915 - 1919	2.77	2.87	2.81
1920 - 1924	3.08	7.38	4.92
1925 - 1929	6.15	4.10	5.27
1930 - 1934	7.69	9.02	8.26
1935 - 1939	10.77	20.08	14.76
1940 - 1944	6.15	5.74	5.98
1945 - 1949	12.62	12.70	12.65
1950 - 1954	31.69	26.64	29.53
1955 - 1959	15.38	7.38	11.95
1960 - June, 1961	2.16	0.00	1.23

88.

YEAR OF DISCHARGE
(From Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1952 July - Dec.	.62	.82	.70
1953	7.08	6.56	6.85
1954	10.77	7.38	9.31
1955	4.00	2.46	3.34
1956	1.23	2.46	1.76
1957	5.23	9.02	6.85
1958	14.15	12.70	13.53
1959	26.46	22.95	24.96
1960	20.92	25.41	22.85
1961 Jan. - June	9.54	10.25	9.84

89.

FIRST COMMUNITY VISIT
(Prep. For Discharge)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1930 - 1934	.31	0.00	.18
1935 - 1939	0.00	2.46	1.05
1940 - 1944	1.54	2.05	1.76
1945 - 1949	2.77	2.05	2.46
1950	2.15	2.05	2.11
1951	5.54	2.87	4.39
1952	3.38	6.15	4.57
1953	12.31	11.07	11.78
1954	9.54	10.66	10.02
1955	7.08	10.25	8.44
1956	9.54	9.43	9.49
1957	10.46	9.43	10.02
1958	13.23	11.48	12.48
1959	8.31	10.66	9.31
1960	12.00	8.61	10.54
1961 Jan. - June	1.85	.82	1.41

90.

MENTAL LEVEL ON ENTRY
(As Then Diagnosed)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Normal	3.1	0.0	1.8
Dull Normal	.9	.8	.9
B Borderline	9.8	5.3	7.9
Educable (Moron)	51.7	67.2	58.3
Trainable (Imbecile)	26.2	23.0	24.8
Dependent (Idiot)	3.1	.4	1.9
Diagnosis Deferred	1.8	0.0	1.1
None Made	3.4	3.3	3.3

91.

MENTAL LEVEL ON EXIT

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Normal	5.5	2.9	4.4
Dull Normal	11.1	6.1	9.0
Borderline	20.6	23.0	21.6
Educable (Moron)	36.9	48.8	42.0
Trainable (Imbecile)	19.7	15.2	17.8
Dependent (Idiot)	2.5	.8	1.8
None Made	3.7	3.3	3.5

92.

ACTUAL PINELAND STAY
(Intramural Period)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
To 1 Month	2.46	0.00	1.41
1 - 6 Months	5.85	2.05	4.22
7 - 12 Months	2.46	1.23	1.94
1 Year	4.62	3.69	4.22
2 Years	7.08	4.10	5.80
3 Years	6.46	6.15	6.33
4 Years	8.31	5.33	7.03
5 Years	6.15	3.28	4.92
6 Years	5.85	5.74	5.80
7 Years	6.77	3.69	5.45
8 Years	4.31	5.33	4.75
9 Years	1.85	3.69	2.64
10 Years	2.15	2.46	2.28
11 Years	1.54	1.23	1.41
12 Years	1.54	2.05	1.76
13 Years	.92	3.28	1.93
14 Years	1.23	4.92	2.81
15 Years	3.08	3.69	3.34
16 Years	2.46	.82	1.76
17 Years	.92	4.51	2.46
18 Years	1.23	3.28	2.11
19 Years	2.15	2.46	2.28
20 - 24 Years	4.92	8.61	6.50
25 - 29 Years	7.69	4.92	6.50
30 - 34 Years	3.38	4.51	3.87
35 - 39 Years	2.15	3.69	2.81
40 - 44 Years	1.23	3.69	2.28
45 - 49 Years	.62	1.23	.88
50 Plus Years	.62	.41	.53

93.

LEGAL PINELAND STAY
(Intra- & Extramural)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
To 1 Month	.92	0.00	.53
1 - 6 Months	4.00	4.82	2.63
7 - 12 Months	.62	0.00	.35
1 Year	4.31	1.23	2.99
2 Years	4.62	1.23	3.16
3 Years	3.08	4.51	3.69
4 Years	10.77	4.92	8.26
5 Years	7.08	4.10	5.80
6 Years	4.31	4.51	4.39
7 Years	4.62	5.33	4.92
8 Years	6.46	4.51	5.67
9 Years	4.00	5.74	4.75
10 Years	4.31	4.51	4.39
11 Years	1.54	2.87	2.11
12 Years	2.77	.82	1.93
13 Years	1.54	2.87	2.11
14 Years	1.54	2.05	1.76
15 Years	1.54	2.46	1.93
16 Years	1.85	2.87	2.28
17 Years	1.85	1.64	1.76
18 Years	.92	2.46	1.58
19 Years	1.23	3.28	2.11
20 - 24 Years	7.38	12.30	9.49
25 - 29 Years	7.69	8.20	7.91
30 - 34 Years	4.31	4.51	4.39
35 - 39 Years	3.38	6.15	4.57
40 - 44 Years	2.15	3.28	2.64
45 - 49 Years	.31	1.23	.70
50 Plus Years	.92	1.64	1.23

94.

I.Q. ON ADMISSION

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 - 4	.31	0.00	.18
5 - 9	.31	0.00	.18
10 - 14	.62	.41	.53
15 - 19	1.54	0.00	.88
20 - 24	.31	.41	.35
25 - 29	1.54	.41	1.05
30 - 34	1.85	1.64	1.76
35 - 39	4.31	3.28	3.87
40 - 44	9.23	9.43	9.31
45 - 49	10.46	11.89	11.07
50 - 54	11.69	15.98	13.53
55 - 59	10.77	19.67	14.59
60 - 64	12.31	15.16	13.53
65 - 69	10.46	8.61	9.67
70 - 74	8.92	8.20	8.61
75 - 79	8.31	1.64	5.45
80 - 84	3.08	2.05	2.64
85 - 89	1.54	.82	1.23
90 - 94	1.54	0.00	.88
95 - 99	.31	0.00	.18
100 - 104	0.00	.41	.18
No Information	.62	0.00	.35

95.

I.Q. ON EXIT

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 - 4	0.00	0.00	0.00
5 - 9	.31	0.00	.18
10 - 14	.31	0.00	.18
15 - 19	0.00	.41	.18
20 - 24	0.00	0.00	0.00
25 - 29	.62	1.64	1.05
30 - 34	.92	.82	.88
35 - 39	3.69	1.23	2.64
40 - 44	5.85	6.15	5.98
45 - 49	4.00	3.28	3.69
50 - 54	4.00	6.56	5.10
55 - 59	6.77	7.79	7.21
60 - 64	6.15	11.89	8.61
65 - 69	11.69	14.75	13.01
70 - 74	6.77	9.02	7.73
75 - 79	12.31	12.70	12.48
80 - 84	6.15	6.97	6.50
85 - 89	3.69	5.33	4.39
90 - 94	3.38	2.46	2.99
95 - 99	1.54	1.23	1.41
100 - 104	.92	.82	.88
105 - 109	.62	0.00	.35
110 - 114	.31	0.00	.18
No Test on Exit	20.00	6.97	14.41

96.

I.Q. TESTS USED
(For Table 94, Admiss.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Revised Binet	25.2	37.3	30.6
Stanford Revised Binet	3.7	4.5	4.0
Stanford Binet L or M	39.7	35.2	37.8
WISC	9.5	3.7	7.0
Wechsler Bellvue I & II	10.8	11.9	11.2
WAIS	3.4	1.2	2.5
Porteus	0.0	0.0	0.0
HTP or Goodenough	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Type	2.2	1.2	1.8
Type Unspecified	5.5	4.5	5.1

97.

I.Q. TESTS USED
(For Table 95, Exit)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Revised Binet	1.2	1.2	1.2
Stanford Revised Binet	.3	0.0	.2
Stanford Binet L or M	26.2	27.0	26.5
WISC	1.5	.8	1.2
Wechsler Bellvue I & II	30.4	39.8	34.4
WAIS	17.5	22.5	19.7
Porteus	.3	0.0	.2
HTP or Goodenough	0.0	.4	.2
Other Type	1.8	.8	1.4
Type Unspecified	.6	.4	.6
No Test on Exit	20.0	7.0	14.3

98.

I.Q. MAXIMUM RANGES
(Max. I.Q.'s For All Pts.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 - 4	.31	0.00	.18
5 - 9	.31	0.00	.18
10 - 14	.62	.41	.53
15 - 19	1.23	0.00	.70
20 - 24	.31	.41	.35
25 - 29	.62	0.00	.35
30 - 34	1.85	1.64	1.76
35 - 39	2.77	2.05	2.46
40 - 44	4.00	2.05	3.16
45 - 49	4.92	3.69	4.39
50 - 54	4.31	4.51	4.39
55 - 59	10.46	8.20	9.49
60 - 64	6.77	11.89	8.96
65 - 69	10.15	15.57	12.48
70 - 74	8.62	13.11	10.54
75 - 79	17.23	15.16	16.34
80 - 84	8.00	6.56	7.38
85 - 89	6.77	6.56	6.68
90 - 94	5.54	4.51	5.10
95 - 99	2.77	1.23	2.11
100 - 104	1.23	1.23	1.23
105 - 109	.92	.41	.70
110 - 114	.31	0.00	.18
115 Plus	0.00	.82	.35

99.

I.Q. MINIMUM RANGES
(Min. IQ's For All Pts.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 - 4	0.00	0.00	0.00
5 - 9	.31	0.00	.18
10 - 14	.31	0.00	.18
15 - 19	.31	.41	.35
20 - 24	.92	1.64	1.23
25 - 29	.92	1.23	1.05
30 - 34	2.77	1.23	2.11
35 - 39	5.85	5.33	5.62
40 - 44	10.77	15.98	13.01
45 - 49	12.92	14.75	13.71
50 - 54	13.23	17.21	14.94
55 - 59	8.00	15.16	11.07
60 - 64	12.00	10.66	11.42
65 - 69	8.62	4.92	7.03
70 - 74	4.62	4.51	4.57
75 - 79	1.54	.82	1.23
80 - 84	.31	.41	.35
85 - 89	.31	0.00	.18
90 - 94	0.00	0.00	0.00
95 - 99	0.00	.41	.18
100 - 104	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Minimum Test	16.31	5.33	11.60

100.

I.Q. TESTS USED
(For Table 98, Max.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Revised Binet	8.3	7.0	7.7
Stanford Revised Binet	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stanford Binet L & M	22.5	11.9	17.9
WISC	5.5	2.0	4.0
Wechsler Bellvue I & II	36.6	49.2	42.0
WAIS	15.1	19.7	17.0
Porteus	2.5	.4	1.6
HTP or Goodenough	1.8	3.7	2.6
Other Type	6.5	4.1	5.4
Type Unspecified	1.2	2.0	1.6

101.

DATE OF TESTING
(For Table 98, Max.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1910 - 1914	.31	.41	.35
1915 - 1919	0.00	0.00	0.00
1920 - 1924	.62	.41	.53
1925 - 1929	1.85	.41	1.23
1930 - 1934	.31	2.05	1.05
1935 - 1939	4.00	3.28	3.69
1940 - 1944	2.77	1.23	2.11
1945 - 1949	7.08	5.74	6.50
1950 - 1954	39.08	46.31	42.18
1955 - 1959	37.85	33.20	35.85
1960 - 1961	3.69	4.10	3.87
Date Unknown	2.46	2.87	2.64

102.

I.Q. TESTS USED
(For Table 99, Min.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Revised Binet	15.1	20.1	17.2
Stanford Revised Binet	7.1	4.9	6.2
Stanford Binet L & M	40.0	48.8	43.8
WISC	4.6	1.2	3.2
Wechsler Bellvue I & II	6.1	10.2	7.9
WAIS	.6	.4	.5
Porteus	0.0	0.0	0.0
HTP or Goodenough	2.2	.8	1.6
Other Type	2.8	3.3	3.0
Type Unspecified	5.2	4.9	5.1
No Minimum Test	16.3	5.3	11.6

103.

DATE OF TESTING
(For Table 99, Min.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1910 - 1914	.31	1.23	.70
1915 - 1919	.31	0.00	.18
1920 - 1924	2.77	3.69	3.16
1925 - 1929	1.54	3.28	2.28
1930 - 1934	7.08	6.97	7.03
1935 - 1939	9.85	12.30	10.90
1940 - 1944	6.15	12.70	8.96
1945 - 1949	12.31	11.89	12.13
1950 - 1954	19.69	20.90	20.21
1955 - 1959	20.31	17.62	19.16
1960 - 1961	1.54	.41	1.05
Date Unknown	1.84	3.69	2.64
No Minimum Test	16.31	5.33	11.60

104.

ETIOLOGY ON ENTRY
(As Then Diagnosed)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Prenatal & Congenital	1.86	2.05	1.94
Pren. & Cong. w. Familial	.93	.82	.88
Pren. & Cong. w CBS	3.39	0.00	1.94
Natal	.93	1.64	1.25
Natal w. Familial	.93	0.00	.54
Natal w. CBS	3.70	1.23	2.65
Intracranial Infections	.62	.41	.53
Intrcr. Inf. w. Familial	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intrcr. Inf. w. CBS	1.24	.41	.90
Brain Trauma	0.00	0.00	0.00
Brain Tr. w. Familial	0.00	.41	.18
Brain Tr. w. CBS	.62	0.00	.36
Eplpsy, Parapl, Convlsv.	.93	.82	.90
E, P, & C, w. Familial	.62	1.64	1.07
E, P, & C, w. CBS	.93	.41	.72
Specific Syndromes	3.09	2.05	2.65
Spec. Syn. w. Familial	.93	.41	.71
Spec. Syn. w. CBS	.62	1.23	.88
Cultl, Behav, Sense Depr.	2.48	.41	1.61
Cu, Be, SD w. Familial	1.24	2.05	1.60
Cu, Be, SD w. CBS	.62	0.00	.36
Unknown Cause	6.78	4.51	5.81
Unkn. C. w. Familial	26.46	40.57	32.51
Unkn. C. w. CBS	1.24	.41	.88
No Diag, Famil. Implied	40.00	38.52	39.37

CBS = Chronic Brain Syndrome

105.

ETIOLOGY ON EXIT
(As Then Diagnosed)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Prenatal & Congenital	.31	0.00	.18
Pren. & Cong. w. Familial	.31	.41	.36
Pren. & Cong. w. CBS	.62	.82	.71
Natal	.62	.41	.54
Natal w. Familial	.31	0.00	.18
Natal w. CBS	1.54	.82	1.24
Intracranial Infections	0.00	.41	.18
Intrcr. Inf. w. Familial	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intrcr. Inf. w. CBS	.31	.82	.53
Brain Trauma	.31	.41	.36
Brain Tr. w. Familial	0.00	0.00	0.00
Brain Tr. w. CBS	.31	0.00	.18
Eplpsy, Parapl, Convlsv.	.31	.82	.53
E, P, & C, w. Familial	0.00	0.00	0.00
E, P, & C, w. CBS	1.24	1.64	1.41
Specific Syndromes	.31	1.23	.71
Spec. Syn. w. Familial	.62	.41	.54
Spec. Syn. w. CBS	1.24	0.00	.72
Cultl, Behav, Sense Depr.	.62	.41	.54
Cu, Be, SD w. Familial	.31	.41	.36
Cu, Be, SD w. CBS	.62	0.00	.36
Unknown Cause	2.78	3.69	3.18
Unkn. C. w. Familial	7.69	15.98	11.25
Unkn. C. w. CBS	1.85	.41	1.24
No Further Diagnosis	77.85	70.90	74.87

106.

EMOTIONAL STABILITY
(While at Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent, Very Stable	2.8	7.0	4.6
Good	36.6	38.1	37.3
Avge. for Institution	24.6	22.1	23.6
Fair, Generalized	20.6	20.5	20.6
Fair, Needs Spec. Envrns.	.3	0.0	.2
Poor, Disturbed, Upset	5.8	4.5	5.3
Very Poor	.6	.4	.5
Mixed	.3	.8	.5
IQ Too Low To Qualify	.6	0.0	.4
Insuffic. Information	7.7	6.6	7.2

107.

PSYCOL. DIAGNOSIS
(Re. Behav. Problems)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Formal Mental Disorder	5.87	9.02	7.22
Personlty, Charactrigcl.	16.93	14.76	15.99
Specif. Organic Disord.	2.47	2.87	2.65
No Diagnos. of Abnorm.	74.73	73.35	74.14

108.

GENERAL HEALTH
(At Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	.62	0.00	.35
Excell.-Good	.92	1.64	1.23
Good	68.00	51.64	60.98
Good-Avge.	4.00	6.15	4.92
Average	14.16	23.36	18.11
Avge - Fair	.62	1.64	1.05
Fair	6.46	5.74	6.16
Fair - Poor	1.85	.82	1.41
Poor	0.00	.41	.18
No Comment	3.38	8.61	5.62

109. TYPES OF ILLNESS	I. MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	II. MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Childhood Diseases	.31	.41	.35	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sinus, Tonsils, etc.	2.15	1.64	1.93	.31	.82	.53
Dental Problems	.31	0.00	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ophthamolog.	.62	.41	.53	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ear Infect.	1.54	1.64	1.58	.31	0.00	.18
Pleurisy	.31	0.00	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Flu, Respir, etc.	2.77	4.10	3.35	1.85	0.00	1.05
Asthma	.31	0.00	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Heart Defect	.92	2.05	1.41	.62	2.05	1.23
Vascular, Arterial	.31	.82	.53	0.00	.41	.18
Ovarian Infection	0.00	2.46	1.05	0.00	.41	.18
Appendicitis	.31	1.23	.70	0.00	.41	.18
Hernia	0.00	0.00	0.00	.31	.41	.35
G.I. Disturbances	.62	.82	.70	0.00	1.23	.53
Misc. Ills	.93	1.64	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Epilepsy	6.15	7.38	6.67	.31	.41	.36
Parapleg. Spastic	.62	1.23	.88	0.00	0.00	0.00
Back Trouble	.31	.41	.35	0.00	0.00	0.00
Arthritis	.92	.82	.88	0.00	1.64	.70
Legs & Feet	0.00	.82	.35	.31	1.23	.70
Skin Disorder	0.00	.41	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Misc. Infections	3.08	1.64	2.46	.31	.41	.35
Several Major Ills	0.00	.41	.18	0.00	1.23	.53
Brucellosis	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.41	.18
Tuberculosis	1.23	2.87	1.93	.31	1.23	.70
Syphilis, Incl. Congen.	.92	2.05	1.41	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pernic. Anemia	0.00	.41	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hypothyroid	0.00	.41	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Neuritis	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.41	.18
Diabetes	.92	.41	.70	.31	0.00	.18
Psychosomatic Ills	2.46	4.92	3.52	.31	2.87	1.41
Debilitation	.62	2.46	1.41	.62	0.00	.35
Obesity	.92	2.87	1.76	.62	0.00	.35
Senility	.31	.82	.53	.31	0.00	.18
None Cited (Other Than Minor)	70.15	52.46	62.57	93.23	84.43	89.45

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL		MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
110.				113.			
GENERAL HANDICAP				SPEECH HANDICAP			
(Total Impression Made)							
Marginal	12.3	16.0	13.9	Marginal	2.2	.4	1.4
Slight	25.5	19.7	23.0	Slight	11.7	10.7	11.2
Slight-Mod.	4.9	4.9	4.9	Slight-Mod.	3.1	.8	2.1
Moderate	8.6	5.7	7.4	Moderate	7.1	2.0	4.9
Mod.-Consid.	.9	1.2	1.1	Mod.-Consid.	.9	.4	.7
Considerable	2.2	.8	1.6	Considerable	2.2	1.2	1.8
Consid.-Extreme	0.0	.4	.2	Consid.-Extreme	1.5	.4	1.1
Extreme	.9	0.0	.5	Extreme	2.5	1.6	2.1
No Impress. of Handcp.	44.6	51.2	47.5	None Apparent	68.9	82.4	74.7
111.				114.			
HEAD & FACIAL HANDICAP				VISION HANDICAP			
Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0	Marginal	.9	.4	.7
Slight	.3	.4	.4	Slight	4.3	3.3	3.9
Slight-Mod.	0.0	0.0	0.0	Slight-Mod.	0.0	.8	.4
Moderate	.3	0.0	.2	Moderate	1.5	1.6	1.6
Mod.-Consid.	0.0	0.0	0.0	Mod.-Consid.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Considerable	0.0	0.0	0.0	Considerable	.6	0.0	.4
Consid.-Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0	Consid.-Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0
Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0	Extreme	.9	0.0	.5
None Apparent	99.4	99.6	99.5	None Apparent	91.7	93.9	92.6
112.				115.			
BODY & LIMBS HANDICAP				HEARING HANDICAP			
Marginal	.3	0.0	.2	Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slight	2.2	1.2	1.8	Slight	1.8	1.2	1.6
Slight-Mod.	.3	0.0	.2	Slight-Mod.	.6	.4	.5
Moderate	2.2	2.0	2.1	Moderate	1.8	.8	1.4
Mod.-Consid.	.6	.4	.5	Mod.-Consid.	.6	0.0	.4
Considerable	0.0	0.0	0.0	Considerable	1.5	.8	1.2
Consid.-Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0	Consid.-Extreme	.3	.4	.4
Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0	Extreme	.3	.8	.5
None Apparent	94.5	96.3	95.3	None Apparent	92.9	95.5	94.0

116.

LOCOMOTOR HANDICAP

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Marginal	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slight	.6	1.6	1.1
Slight-Mod.	.3	.4	.4
Moderate	1.2	3.3	2.1
Mod.-Consid.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Considerable	.6	1.2	.9
Consid.-Extreme	0.0	0.0	0.0
Extreme	.6	0.0	.4
None Apparent	96.6	93.4	95.3

117.

ACADEMIC TRAINING

(Max Grade at Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Sub-Primary	6.8	2.0	4.7
Grade 1	10.2	6.6	8.6
Grade 2	7.7	2.9	5.6
Grade 3	13.2	13.5	13.4
Grade 4	12.6	10.2	11.6
Grade 5	9.5	13.1	11.1
Grade 6	.9	2.9	1.8
Grade 7 & 8	1.2	2.0	1.6
Attended, Grade Unknown	2.2	2.0	2.1
No Acad. Training Rec'd.	35.7	44.7	39.5

118.

SPECIAL CLASS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Attended	8.3	9.0	8.6
Not Attended	91.7	91.0	91.4

119.

OTHER TYPES OF CLASSES

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Class for Trainables	1.8	2.0	1.9
Remedial Reading	8.0	.4	4.7
"Money" Class	1.5	2.5	1.9
Social Adjust. Class	1.2	.8	1.1
Class for the Blind	.3	0.0	.2
O. Types Not Attended	87.1	94.3	90.2

Note: The above classes, esp. 3,4,5, are not mutually exclusive.

120.

ERA OF TRAINING

(Tables 117, 118, 119)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Before 1953	43.4	49.6	46.0
Some Before, Some After	20.0	25.0	22.1
1953 & After	36.3	25.4	31.6
Uncertain	.3	0.0	.2

121.

VOCATIONAL CLASSES

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Manual Training	26.5	0.0	15.1
Textile Repair	0.0	9.0	3.9
Dressmaking & Tailoring	0.0	21.7	9.3
Home Economics	3.1	27.9	13.7
Vocational Agriculture	9.5	0.0	5.4
Driver Education	6.2	1.6	4.2

Note: The above classes are not mutually exclusive

122.

OTHER TYPES OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING
(Intramural)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Hill Farm	13.55	0.00	7.74
Valley Farm	12.31	0.00	7.04
O. Farm Work	1.23	0.00	.71
Works on Grounds	7.70	0.00	4.39
O. Intramural	.62	0.00	.36
Odd Jobs	.31	0.00	.18
House Boy (or Girl)	.31	.41	.35
Production Shop	9.23	0.00	5.28
Industrial Shop	2.46	6.56	4.22
Boys' Industrial	23.08	0.00	13.18
Girls' Industrial	0.00	33.00	14.42
Sub .Industrial	3.08	1.23	2.28
Vocational	.31	.82	.53
Boys' Vocational	.31	0.00	.18
Woodrow Wilson School	.62	.82	.71
Kitchen Work	9.57	21.73	14.76
Kitch. W. & Waitress	0.00	2.05	.88
Waitress, Waiter	.62	10.25	4.75
Housekeeping Work	.62	20.50	9.14
Sewing Room	0.00	7.79	3.34
Knit & Loom	0.00	.41	.18
Laundry Work	3.08	11.07	6.51
Canteen	0.00	.41	.18
Ward Work	11.38	15.17	13.01
Hospital Helper	8.92	2.87	6.32
Pharmacist Ass't	.31	0.00	.18
Hosp. Lab. Helper	0.00	.82	.36
Music	0.00	.41	.18
Woodworking	.93	.82	.88
Handcraft	0.00	.41	.18
Bakery	.62	.41	.53
Print Shop	8.32	0.00	4.76
Mail Carrier	1.54	0.00	.88
Power House	3.69	0.00	2.12
Store Helper	2.16	0.00	1.23
Shoe Repair	.62	0.00	.36
Paint Shop	1.54	0.00	.88
Carpenter's Helper	2.16	0.00	1.23
Engineer's Helper	.31	0.00	.18
Occup. Maintenance	.62	0.00	.36
Work in Building	6.16	9.84	7.73
Truck Driver's Helper	.31	0.00	.18
Mason's Helper	.31	0.00	.18
Phys. Educ.	0.00	4.10	1.76

Note: The above groups are not mutually exclusive.

NO. OF ABOVE TRAINING TYPES TAKEN:

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	25.54	20.49	23.37
One or More	74.46	79.51	76.63
Two or More	42.46	48.36	44.99
Three or More	17.54	18.85	18.10
Four or More	4.62	5.33	4.92

123.

ERA OF TRAINING
(Table 122.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Before 1953	37.5	40.6	38.8
Some Before, Some After	22.5	32.0	26.5
1953 & After	39.4	27.0	34.1
Uncertain	.6	.4	.5

124.

O. REMEDIAL TREATMENT
(Types of Treatment or Conditions Treated)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Minor Ills	80.60	83.20	81.70
Minor Injuries	54.80	43.40	49.90
Dental Work	63.70	78.30	69.90
Glasses, etc.	21.50	43.40	30.90
Major Surgery	3.70	9.80	6.80
Corrective Surgery	1.20	2.50	1.80
Minor Surgery	11.07	12.30	11.60
Bone Fracture	2.46	2.46	2.47
Tonsils & Adenoids	10.77	14.35	12.30
Eugenic Sterilization	6.20	20.90	12.50
Epilepsy	3.07	4.92	3.87
Tuberculosis	2.16	2.46	2.30
Venereal Disease	1.54	4.92	2.00
Psychotherapies	2.47	5.33	3.70
Occupational Therapy	12.60	20.10	15.80
Physical Therapy	3.10	.80	2.10
Speech Therapy	2.20	.80	1.60

Note: The above categories are not mutually exclusive.

125.

LEVEL OF SOCIAL FUNCTIONING
(Rel. to Total Inst. Pop.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Highest	.62	0.00	.35
Higher	44.00	46.31	44.99
Mid-Higher	28.31	30.33	29.17
Middle	18.77	18.44	18.63
Mid-Lower	4.31	3.69	4.04
Lower	3.38	1.23	2.46
Low-Nadir	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nadir	.31	0.00	.18
No Information	.31	0.00	.18

126.

ATTITUDES RE. ACAD. WORK

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	4.6	5.3	4.9
Good	19.4	27.0	22.7
Good-Avge.	2.2	3.3	2.6
Average	9.8	9.0	9.5
Avge.-Fair	1.2	2.5	1.8
Fair	10.2	3.3	7.2
Fair-Poor	4.3	1.2	3.0
Poor	4.9	2.0	3.7
Mixed	1.8	2.0	1.9
No Acad. or No Info.	41.5	44.3	42.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
127.			
ATTITUDES RE. VOCAT. WORK			
Excellent	4.3	9.0	6.3
Good	26.2	33.2	29.2
Good-Avge.	3.7	4.9	4.2
Average	13.5	14.8	14.1
Avge.-Fair	1.2	2.0	1.6
Fair	12.0	5.3	9.1
Fair-Poor	2.5	2.0	2.3
Poor	4.3	1.6	3.2
Mixed	5.8	4.9	5.4
No Vocat. or No Info.	26.5	22.1	24.6
128.			
PROPERTY DESTRUCTION			
(At Pineland)			
None	78.2	88.9	82.8
None-Slight	4.9	1.6	3.5
Slight	5.8	4.9	5.4
Slight-Mod.	1.5	.8	1.2
Moderate	4.3	.8	2.8
Mod.-Consid.	.3	0.0	.2
Considerable	2.5	.8	1.8
I.Q. Too Low to Qualify	.6	.4	.5
No Information	1.8	1.6	1.8

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
129.			
THEFT			
(At Pineland)			
None	75.4	79.9	77.3
None-Slight	2.5	3.3	2.8
Slight	10.5	7.8	9.3
Slight-Mod.	.6	.8	.7
Moderate	4.6	2.0	3.5
Mod.-Consid	.3	1.2	.7
Considerable	2.2	.8	1.6
I.Q. Too Low to Qualify	.9	.8	.9
No Information	3.1	3.3	3.2
130.			
BEHAVIOR TOWARD PERSONNEL			
(At Pineland)			
Affect	39.7	54.5	46.0
Average	38.2	18.4	29.7
Troublesome	6.8	4.9	6.0
Trouble & Affect	11.1	14.8	12.7
Physical Violence	.9	.8	.9
Phys. Viol. & Troub.	1.2	.8	1.1
Phys. V. & Troub. & Affect	0.0	3.3	1.4
Withdrawal, Timidity	.9	1.2	1.1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Information	1.2	1.2	1.2

131.

BEHAVIOR TOWARD PEERS
(At Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Affect	37.8	55.3	45.3
Average	40.9	22.5	33.0
Troublesome	2.5	2.5	2.5
Trouble & Affect	4.0	10.7	6.9
Physical Violence	2.8	1.2	2.1
Phys. Viol. & Troub.	4.9	1.6	3.5
Phys. V. & Troub. & Affect	2.8	3.3	3.0
Withdrawal, Timidity	.9	.8	.9
Other	.3	.0	.2
No Information	3.1	2.0	2.6

132.

OVERT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR
(Heterosexual)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Absent, Insignificant	10.2	14.8	12.1
Slight	8.9	18.9	13.2
Slight-Mod.	4.9	6.6	5.6
Moderate	8.0	19.3	12.8
Mod.-Consid.	.6	2.0	1.2
Considerable	.9	4.5	2.5
Consid.-Excess.	.3	.8	.5
Excessive	.3	0.0	.2
No Information or No Comment	65.8	33.2	51.8

133.

OVERT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR
(Homosexual)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Absent, Insignificant	7.1	20.9	13.0
Slight	14.2	8.2	11.6
Slight-Mod.	4.0	.8	2.6
Moderate	13.8	8.6	11.6
Mod.-Consid.	1.2	0.0	.7
Considerable	1.5	1.2	1.4
Consid.-Excess.	.3	0.0	.2
Excessive	.6	0.0	.4
No Information or No Comment	57.2	60.2	58.5

134.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN
(Parenthood at Instit.)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	99.7	97.1	98.6
One	.3	2.5	1.2
Two	0.0	.4*	.2

*Twins

135.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN
(Tab. 134 - Where Conceived or Sired)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Before Admission			
1 Child	0.0	1.2	.5
2 (Twins)	0.0	.4	.2
On Grounds - 1	.3	0.0	.2
Community Placement - 1	0.0	1.2	.5
None	99.7	97.1	98.6

136.

GENERAL "OBEDIENCE"
(At Pineland)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	3.1	9.4	5.8
Good	42.5	45.5	43.8
Average	34.5	29.5	32.3
Poor	5.8	3.3	4.7
Worst	.3	.4	.4
Mixed	4.9	6.1	5.4
I.Q. Too Low to Qualify	.6	0.0	.4
No Information	8.3	5.7	7.2

137.

ESCAPES FROM INSTITUT.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	56.31	85.66	68.89
One	12.62	11.48	12.13
Two	10.15	1.64	6.50
Three	6.15	.82	3.87
Four	2.46	0.00	1.41
Five	3.69	.41	2.28
Six	1.85	0.00	1.05
Seven	1.85	0.00	1.05
Eight	1.85	0.00	1.05
Nine	.92	0.00	.53
Ten	1.23	0.00	.70
11 - 17	.92	0.00	.53

138.

TYPE OF ESCAPE
(Table 137)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Uncertain	12.0	4.1	8.6
Diffuse - To Get Away	14.2	5.7	10.5
Reaction to Authority	1.5	1.6	1.6
Skylarking Spree	3.1	.4	1.9
To Specific Goal	12.6	2.5	8.3
Other	.3	0.0	.2
No Escapes	56.3	85.7	68.9

139.

EFFORTS FOR DISCHARGE
(By Family of Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Mother	49.8	43.4	47.1
Father	28.0	20.5	24.8
Son &/or Daughter	0.0	1.6	.8
Step Parent(s)	2.4	4.1	3.2
Foster Parent(s)	2.4	6.1	4.1
Brother(s)	8.0	15.5	11.3
Sister(s)	13.8	32.4	21.8
O. Close Relatives	5.9	14.7	9.7
Dist. Rels., Friends	2.4	5.3	3.7
Other	0.0	2.8	1.3
No Efforts Recorded	32.0	23.0	28.1

Note: Above categories, except for "No Efforts", are not mutually exclusive.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
140.			
EFFORTS FOR DISCHARGE			
(Tab. 139 - Methods Used)			
I.			
Letters to Superintndnt	64.3	74.6	68.7
No Letters	33.8	25.0	30.1
Unclear	1.8	.4	1.2
II.			
Lawyer, Single Effort	5.8	8.2	6.9
Lawyer(s), Mult. Efforts	7.0	9.8	8.2
No Lawyer Used	85.5	81.6	83.8
Unclear	1.5	.4	1.1
III.			
Politicl Persn, Sing. Eff.	.6	2.5	1.4
Pol Persn(s), Mult. Effs.	5.2	2.4	4.2
No Pol Person Used	92.6	95.1	93.7
Unclear	1.5	0.0	.9
141.			
FAMILY VISITS TO INSTIT.			
(Persons Visiting)			
Mother	56.6	45.0	51.7
Father	35.4	22.5	29.9
Son &/or Daughter	.3	2.4	1.3
Step Parent(s)	6.7	7.8	7.2
Foster Parent(s)	3.4	7.7	5.4
Brother(s)	22.2	25.8	23.8
Sister(s)	29.2	43.0	35.2
O. Close Relatives	17.1	24.2	20.3
Dist. Rels., Friends	10.5	18.8	14.0
Other	.3	4.0	1.9
No Visits & No Info.	16.3	13.1	14.9

Note: Above categories, except for "No Visits", are not mutually exclusive.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
142.			
FAMILY VISITS TO INSTIT.			
(Number of Visits)			
None	13.2	12.3	12.8
1 - 3	15.4	13.1	14.4
4 - 10	22.5	22.1	22.3
11 - 24	17.8	20.1	18.8
25 - 49	5.2	10.7	7.6
50 - 90	2.2	2.0	2.1
100 & More	1.5	0.0	.9
Number Uncertain	16.0	15.6	15.8
No Information	6.2	4.1	5.3
143.			
PATIENT'S HOME VISITS			
None	52.0	52.9	52.4
Few, Brief Visits (1-3)	8.0	12.3	9.8
Few, Longer Visits	18.2	11.9	15.5
Few, Mixed Visits	.6	.8	.7
Scattered, Brief Visits	5.5	9.0	7.0
Regular, Brief Visits	6.8	6.1	6.5
Regular, Longer Visits	4.3	3.7	4.0
Frequent, Mixed Visits	3.4	2.5	3.0
Unclear	1.2	.8	1.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
144.			
ROOM & BOARD PAYMENTS (At Pineland)			
Entirely by State	82.5	88.1	84.9
State More, Home Less	2.2	1.2	1.8
State & Home, ½ & ½	2.5	.4	1.6
Home More, State Less	.3	.4	.4
Entirely by Home	8.9	7.8	8.4
St. & Home, Irreg. Mix	0.0	.4	.2
St. & Home, %'s Unclear	1.5	0.0	.9
O. Agency & State	1.2	1.2	1.2
Unclear	.9	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
145.			
CLOTHING SUPPLIED			
Entirely State	78.2	86.1	81.5
State More, Home Less	2.2	1.6	1.9
State & Home, ½ & ½	2.2	2.0	2.1
Home More, State Less	0.0	.4	.2
Entirely by Home	11.7	4.9	8.8
State & Home, %'s Unclear	3.4	1.2	2.5
O. Agency & State	1.5	3.3	2.3
Unclear	.9	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
146.			
PT'S RELEASE EFFORTS			
Gen'l Wish for Discharge	68.3	76.2	71.7
Gen'l Wish Vs. Discharge	.9	.4	.7
Ambivalent	4.0	2.0	3.2
Gave Up Hope	0.0	.4	.2
I.Q. Too Low to Qualify	1.5	1.2	1.4
Unknown	25.2	19.7	22.9

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
147.			
PT'S RELEASE EFFORTS (Tab. 146 - Methods Used)			
I. Letters to Supt.			
None	4.9	2.9	4.0
1 - 3	4.6	2.9	3.9
4 - 10	.3	.8	.5
11 - 24	0.0	.4	.2
"Some"	11.1	21.3	15.5
I.Q. Too Low to Qual.	1.2	1.6	1.4
No Info, Prob. None	77.8	70.1	74.5
II. Letters to Family			
None	4.0	1.6	3.0
1 - 3	.3	0.0	.2
4 - 10	.3	1.2	.7
11 - 24	.6	.4	.5
25 - 49	0.0	.4	.2
"Some"	6.5	12.7	9.1
I.Q. Too Low to Qual.	1.2	1.6	1.4
No Info, Uncertain	87.1	82.0	84.9

148.

EXTRAMURAL ODD JOBS
(Prep. for Discharge)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Odd Jobs	50.2	29.5	41.3
No Odd Jobs	49.8	70.5	58.7

149.

TRIAL VISIT EMPLOYMENT
(Number of Placements)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	16.6	21.3	18.6
Two	12.9	11.5	12.3
Three	7.1	13.1	9.7
Four	5.5	8.2	6.7
Five	2.5	4.1	3.2
6 - 8	4.6	9.8	6.9
9 - 10	.9	.8	.9
11 - 15	2.5	1.6	2.1
None	47.4	29.5	39.7

150.

PROLONGED (HOME) VISITS
(Number of Placements)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	37.5	29.9	34.3
Two	5.5	4.9	5.3
Three	.9	.4	.7
None	56.0	64.8	59.8

151.

SHORT TRIAL VISITS
(Number of Placements)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	8.0	10.7	9.1
Two	3.7	4.5	4.0
Three	2.5	1.6	2.1
Four	1.5	1.6	1.6
Five	.3	.4	.4
6 - 15	1.2	.4	.9
None	82.8	80.7	81.9

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
152.			
TV.STV.PV TERMINATIONS: I			
m			
Ending in Discharge	77.24	86.07	81.02
No Visits Ever	14.76	7.38	11.60
No Vis. Ending in Disch.	8.00	6.55	7.38
152A.			
TV.STV.PV TERMINATIONS: II (Not Ending in Discharge)			
m			
Reason Unclear			
1 Visit	5.39	6.22	5.82
2	2.87	1.03	1.94
3	.35	.34	.35
4	.35	.34	.35
Nature of Work			
1 Visit	12.58	11.07	11.81
2	3.95	5.88	4.93
3	4.31	3.11	3.70
4	2.15	2.76	2.46
5	2.51	1.03	1.76
6	1.79	.34	1.05
7	1.43	0.00	.70
8	.71	0.00	.35
Premature, Reason Unclear			
1 Visit	.71	1.38	1.05
2	0.00	.34	.17
Chance & Accidentl Cause			
1 Visit	12.23	11.76	11.99
2	3.23	4.84	4.05
3	.35	1.73	1.05
4	.71	.69	.70
5	0.00	.34	.17
Combntns of Above Causes			
1 Visit	1.07	3.46	2.29
2	.35	.69	.52
3	.35	.69	.52
4	0.00	.34	.17
Vis. Unsat - Reasn Unclear			
1 Visit	0.00	.34	.17
Emplyr or Suprvsr Fault			
1 Visit	1.07	6.92	4.05
2	.71	1.38	1.05
Fault of Patient			
1 Visit	16.54	12.45	14.46
2	7.19	4.84	5.99
3	5.39	5.19	5.29
4	2.51	1.73	2.11
5	1.07	.69	.88
6	2.15	1.03	1.58
7	1.07	0.00	.52
8	.35	.34	.35
9	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	0.00	.69	.35
Mutual Fault			
1 Visit	4.31	5.53	4.93
2	0.00	.34	.17

NOTE: Above percentages in Table 152A are based on total number of such visits, not on number of patients. Counts on such visits are:
For Males: 278 For Females: 289 For M & F: 567

153.

PERSONS DISCHARGED TO

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Self	44.62	45.90	45.17
Self w. Conservator	12.62	27.05	18.80
Self w. Guardian	1.23	1.23	1.23
Mother & Father	15.08	3.69	10.19
Mother	8.62	5.33	7.21
Mo. & Step Fa.	2.15	1.64	1.93
Father	.92	.82	.88
Fa. & Step Mo.	1.85	1.23	1.58
Other Relative	4.31	4.92	4.57
O. Rel. w. Conservator	0.00	.41	.18
Foster Parent(s)	.62	.41	.53
Husband	0.00	.82	.35
Son or Daughter	0.00	.41	.18
Reform School	.62	0.00	.35
Reformatory	2.46	0.00	1.41
Prison	.62	0.00	.35
City Farm	0.00	.41	.18
Probation	.92	0.00	.53
Court Custody	.31	0.00	.18
Mental Hospital	.62	2.46	1.41
O. Retard. Hospital	.31	.82	.53
Dept. Health & Welfare	1.23	.41	.88
Job Placement	.31	1.64	.88
Self w. Formal Agency	.31	.41	.35
Self w. Relatives	.31	0.00	.18

154.

CONDITIONS OF DISCHARGE

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Capable of Self Support	52.31	63.93	57.29
Partial Self Support	5.24	7.38	6.15
Not Capable Self Supp.	.31	.41	.35
Request of Relatives	2.46	4.10	3.16
Request of Parents	12.92	7.79	10.72
Request of Adopt. Parents	0.00	.41	.18
Parental Custody	5.54	1.23	3.69
Family Custody, Supervis.	1.23	.82	1.06
H & W Aid to Disabled	3.38	2.87	3.16
H & W Aid to Blind	.31	0.00	.18
H & W Old Age Asst.	2.46	4.92	3.51
H & W Custody (Minor)	0.00	.41	.18
VA Support	.31	0.00	.18
Correct. Instit. (Adult)	3.08	0.00	1.76
Non-Correct. Instit.	1.23	3.69	2.28
Recommend. of Staff	1.23	.41	.88
I.Q. Too High	4.92	0.00	2.81
Illegal Placemt at Inst.	.31	.41	.35
Court Order	1.23	.41	.88
Expir. of Sentence	.31	0.00	.18
On Escape	.31	0.00	.18
Unclear	.92	.82	.88

155.

IMPROVED AT DISCHARGE

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Improved	61.23	65.98	63.27
Minor Improvement	.62	0.00	.36
Not Improved	12.00	6.15	9.49
No Statement	26.15	27.87	26.89

156.

LOCATION AT DISCHARGE
(Of Patient)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Trial Visit	36.00	56.56	44.82
Short Trial Visit	.92	0.00	.53
Prolonged (Home) Visit	36.31	28.28	32.86
P.V. with Employment	3.08	1.64	2.46
Brief Home Visit	.92	.41	.70
Pineland Hospital	17.54	12.30	15.29
Other Institution	0.00	.41	.18
On Escape	5.23	.41	3.17

POST-DISCHARGE PERIOD

The data that follows deals entirely with the post-discharge careers of the patients. This data was obtained approximately four to ten years after discharge. Some minor discrepancies may be seen in percentages; following computer availability for one-column code analysis, we were able to add ten additional cases to our post-discharge coverage. These latter cases are included in subsequent multiple-column code analysis. The actual counts are as follows:

	Males	Females	Total
Single Column (s)	313	237	550
Multiple Column (m)	320	240	560

The informational present moment is the date of collection of data on the individual dischargee. The great majority of interviews were in 1964 and 1965, with the later dischargees being the last to be interviewed.

Tables 157, 158, and 159 below, of Interview Type and Other Sources of dischargee coverage are in addition to the records regularly obtained through standard state, municipal, and town sources, cited in the text.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
157.			
INTERVIEW TYPE			
s			
With Dischargee	47.0	67.9	56.0
W. Intimate of Disch.	39.0	19.8	30.7
W. Acquaint. of Disch.	3.5	4.2	3.8
In-State Informant	1.9	0.0	1.1
Interview Not a Source	8.6	8.0	8.4
158.			
INTERVIEW TYPE			
(Additional)			
s			
W. Intimate of Disch.	24.6	35.4	29.3
W. Acquaint. of Disch.	8.9	8.0	8.5
In-State Informant	0.0	.4	.2
No Additional Type	66.5	56.1	62.0
159.			
OTHER SOURCES			
s			
Personal Letters	1.3	2.5	1.8
Semi-Official Letters	1.3	1.3	1.3
Questionnaire	2.9	2.1	2.5
O. Instit. Case History	9.3	4.6	7.3
O. Agency Records	36.1	39.7	37.6
Pineland Readm. Case H.	1.3	1.3	1.3
Miscell.	.9	3.0	1.8
O. Sources Not Used	47.0	45.6	46.4

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
160.			
LIVING OR DEAD			
s			
Living	96.2	97.0	96.5
Dead	3.8	3.0	3.5
161.			
YEAR OF DEATH			
m			
1960	0.00	.42	.18
1961	1.25	.83	1.07
1962	.94	.42	.71
1963	.31	.42	.36
1964	.94	.83	.89
1965	.63	0.00	.36
Not Dead	95.94	97.08	96.43
162.			
CAUSES OF DEATH			
m			
Flu Epidemic	0.00	.42	.18
Pneumonia	.63	.42	.54
Hypertensive Heart	.31	0.00	.18
Heart, & H. Attack	.62	.82	.72
Arteriosclerosis	.31	0.00	.18
Stroke	0.00	.42	.18
Blood Clot	0.00	.42	.18
Ruptured Appendix	.31	0.00	.18
Peritonitis	.31	0.00	.18
Cancer	.31	.42	.36
Drowning	.63	0.00	.36
Crushed by Bulldozer	.31	0.00	.18
Suffocation	.31	0.00	.18
Not Dead	95.94	97.08	96.43

163. GENERAL HEALTH (Reported by Ex-Pt.)	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
Excellent	5.94	3.33	4.82
Good	32.50	51.67	40.71
Average	2.81	7.50	4.82
Fair	2.81	5.83	4.11
Poor	.31	.83	.54
No Statement	55.63	30.83	45.00

164. GENERAL HEALTH (Opin. of Interviewer)	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
Excellent	5.31	2.08	3.93
Good	40.63	38.33	39.64
Average	9.38	12.08	10.54
Fair	5.00	7.08	5.89
Poor	.63	2.08	1.25
Deceased Dischargee 6 Mo. Before Death			
Good	.31	0.00	.18
Average	1.56	0.00	.89
Fair	.94	.83	.89
Poor	0.00	.42	.18
No Data	36.25	37.08	36.60

165. GENERAL HEALTH (Opin. of Others)	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
Excellent	5.63	3.75	4.82
Good	38.75	23.33	32.14
Average	8.75	7.50	8.21
Fair	2.81	4.17	3.39
Poor	.31	1.67	.89
Deceased Dischargee 6 Mo. Before Death			
Good	.31	.83	.54
Average	1.25	0.00	.71
Fair	.63	.83	.71
Poor	.63	1.25	.89
No Data	40.94	56.66	47.67

166. PRESENT RELIGION	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
None	14.69	9.17	12.32
Catholic	33.44	30.83	32.32
Jewish	0.00	.42	.18
Protestant, Unspecif.	20.63	17.50	19.29
Prot. Moderate	24.06	32.08	27.50
Prot. Fundamentalist	6.88	8.33	7.50
Other Xtian Sect	.31	0.00	.18
Unknown	0.00	1.67	.71

167.

MILITARY SERVICE

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Military Service	3.2	0.0	1.8
None	96.8	100.0	98.2

168.

BRANCH OF MILITARY

m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Army	1.56	0.00	.89
Navy	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marines	.63	0.00	.36
National Guard	.63	0.00	.36
Air Force	.31	0.00	.18
No Mil. Service	96.88	100.00	98.21

169.

LENGTH OF MIL. SERVICE

m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1 - 2 Months	.31	0.00	.18
3 - 6 Months	.63	0.00	.36
1 Year	.31	0.00	.18
2 Years	.63	0.00	.36
3 Years	.63	0.00	.36
4 Years	.63	0.00	.36
No Mil. Service	96.88	100.00	98.21

170.

MARRIED SINCE DISCHARGE

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Married Since Discharge	20.1	42.2	29.6
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.9	56.9	70.0
Unknown	0.0	.8	.4

171.

TYPE OF MARRIAGE
(Last Marriage)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Common Law	1.0	7.6	3.8
Civil	8.3	15.6	11.5
Religious Ceremony	9.2	18.6	13.3
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.9	56.9	70.0
Unknown	1.6	1.5	1.5

172.

NUMBER OF MARRIAGES
(Since Discharge)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	17.9	38.4	26.7
Two	1.9	3.4	2.5
Three	.3	0.0	.2
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.9	56.9	70.0
Unknown	0.0	1.3	.5

173. STILL WITH SPOUSE (Post-Dischar. Spouse) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Still with Spouse	16.3	35.9	24.7
Not with Spouse	3.8	6.3	4.9
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.9	56.9	70.0
Unknown	0.0	.8	.4

174. YEAR OF LAST MARRIAGE m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1953	0.00	1.25	.54
1954	0.00	1.25	.54
1955	.31	3.33	1.61
1956	.94	.83	.89
1957	.63	1.25	.89
1958	.94	.83	.89
1959	2.81	5.83	4.11
1960	3.44	7.08	5.00
1961	3.75	6.25	4.82
1962	2.50	4.17	3.21
1963	.63	2.08	1.25
1964	3.13	3.75	3.39
1965	1.56	2.50	1.96
Year Uncertain	0.00	2.50	1.07
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.37	56.25	69.47
Unknown	0.00	0.83	0.36

175. REASON NOT WITH SPOUSE (Last Post-Disch. Spouse) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Spouse Died	0.00	.83	.36
Divorce	1.88	2.50	2.14
Separation	.94	.83	.89
Annulled	.31	0.00	.18
End Common Law	.31	1.25	.71
Temporary Separation	.31	.83	.54
Spouse Jailed	0.00	.42	.18
Still with Spouse	16.88	36.25	25.17
Not Mar. Since Disch.	79.38	56.25	69.47
Unknown	0.00	.83	.36

176. PARENTHOOD (Post-Discharge) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Parenthood	10.2	19.0	14.0
No Parenthood	89.8	81.0	86.0

177. PARENTHOOD - NO. OF TIMES s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	3.2	10.1	6.2
Two	3.5	7.2	5.1
Three	2.6	1.3	2.0
Four	.3	.4	.4
Five	.6	0.0	.4
None	89.8	81.0	86.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
178.			
PARENT. - MALE CHILDREN			
(No. of Times)			
s			
One	4.8	8.9	6.5
Two	2.6	3.4	2.9
Three	.6	0.0	.4
None	91.4	87.8	89.8
Unknown	.6	0.0	.4
179.			
PARENT. - FEMALE CHILDREN			
(No. of Times)			
s			
One	3.8	8.0	5.6
Two	1.6	2.5	2.0
Three	.6	.4	.5
None	93.3	89.0	91.5
Unknown	.6	0.0	.4
180.			
PARENT. - LEGIT. CHILDREN			
(No. of Times)			
s			
One	3.2	7.6	5.1
Two	3.8	3.4	3.6
Three	2.2	1.3	1.8
Four	.6	.4	.5
Five	.3	0.0	.2
None	89.8	87.3	88.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
181.			
PARENT. - ILLEGIT. CHILDREN			
(No. of Times)			
s			
One	.6	5.9	2.9
Two	0.0	2.1	.9
None	99.4	92.0	96.2
182.			
PARENT. - DECEASED CHILD.			
s			
All Born: Deceased	.6	.4	.5
Some Dec., Some Not	1.6	.4	1.1
All Born: Living	8.0	18.1	12.3
No Children	89.8	81.0	86.0
183.			
PARENT. - DECEASED CHILD.			
(No. of Times)			
s			
One	1.9	.8	1.4
Two	.3	0.0	.2
None	97.8	99.2	98.4

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
184.			
PARENT - DECEASED CHILD.			
(Sex and Age)			
s			
One Male	1.9	.4	1.3
No Males Dec.	98.1	99.6	98.7
One Female	.6	.4	.5
No Females Dec.	99.4	99.6	99.5
Stillborn: One	.6	.4	.5
Birth - 1 Yr: One	1.0	0.0	.5
1 - 4 Yrs: One	.3	.4	.4
Unknown: One	.6	0.0	.4
None Dec.	97.5	99.2	98.2
Legit: One	1.9	.8	1.4
Illegit: One	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unknown	.6	0.0	.4
None Dec.	97.5	99.2	98.2

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
185.			
RESIDENCE OF CHILDREN			
(With Parents)			
s			
All Born w. Parent	7.3	15.2	10.7
Some With, Some Not	.3	.4	.4
All Born Away From Par.	2.6	3.4	2.9
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
186.			
LEGIT. CHILD. W. PARENTS			
s			
One	2.2	6.8	4.2
Two	2.9	3.4	3.1
Three	2.2	1.7	2.0
Four	0.0	0.0	0.0
Five	.3	0.0	.2
Doesn't Apply	92.3	88.2	90.5

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
187.			
ILLEGIT. CHILD. W. PARENTS			
s			
One	.3	4.6	2.2
Two	0.0	.8	.4
Doesn't Apply	99.7	94.5	97.5

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
188.			
STEPCHILD. W. PARENTS			
s			
One	.3	.4	.3
Two	.3	0.0	.2
Three	0.0	0.0	0.0
Four	0.0	0.0	0.0
Five	0.0	0.0	0.0
Six	0.0	.4	.2
Seven	0.0	.4	.2
Doesn't Apply	99.4	98.7	99.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
189.			
ADOPT. CHILD. W. PARENT			
s			
One	0.0	.4	.2
Doesn't Apply	100.0	99.6	99.8

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
190.			
CHILD. W. SEPAR. SPOUSE			
s			
All Born w. Sep. Spouse	.6	0.0	.3
Some With, Some Not	.6	0.0	.3
All Born Not w. Sep. Sp.	8.9	19.0	13.3
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0
191.			
CHILD. W. PAR.'S RELATIVES			
(Rels. of Dischargee)			
s			
All Born w. Par. Rel.	0.0	.9	.3
Some With, Some Not	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Born Not w. Par. Rel.	10.2	18.1	13.7
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0
192.			
CHILD. W. O. RELATIVES			
(Spouse's Relatives)			
s			
All Born w. Sp. Rel.	.3	0.0	.2
Some With, Some Not	.3	0.0	.2
All Born Not w. Sp. Rel.	9.6	19.0	13.7
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
193.			
CHILD. W. AGENCY			
(Health & Welfare)			
s			
All Born w. Agency	0.0	1.3	.5
Some With, Some Not	.3	.8	.5
All Born Not w. Agency	9.9	16.9	12.9
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0
194.			
CHILD. IN ORPHANAGE			
s			
All Born in Orph.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Some In, Some Not	.3	0.0	.2
All Born, None in Orph.	9.9	19.0	13.8
None Born	89.8	81.0	86.0
195.			
AID DEPENDENT CHILDREN			
(A.D.C. Received)			
s			
A.D.C. Rec'd in Past	.3	.4	.3
A.D.C. Rec'd Now	.3	3.8	1.8
A.D.C. Never Rec'd	9.6	14.3	11.6
Unclear	0.0	.4	.2
No Children Born	89.8	81.0	86.0

196.

A.D.C. AMOUNT RECEIVED
(Past or Now, Per Week)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
$ 0 - $20	0.00	2.08	.89
$21 - $40	.31	2.08	1.07
Unclear	.31	.42	.36
Doesn't Apply	99.38	95.42	97.68

NOTE: Tables 170 through 175 tell whether or not the dischargee has been married since discharge. Tables 197 through 214, which here follow, give information about dischargees' spouses. As adequate information was not available on a few chronologically more remote post-discharge spouses, these were not included in the latter tables. However, there are included the three pre-admission spouses with whom dischargees were still living. Accordingly the totals in the two sets of tables, in the former for "Not Married Since Discharge" and in the latter for "No Present or Recent Spouse" will differ slightly. A recent but not present spouse can be one who is separated, divorced, deceased, etc.

197.

SPOUSE LIVING

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Spouse Living	20.4	40.9	29.2
Spouse Deceased	0.0	.8	.4
Uncertain	0.0	.4	.2
No Pres. or Rec. Spouse	79.6	57.8	70.2

198.

PRESENT OR LAST SPOUSE

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Present Spouse	17.9	36.7	26.0
Last Spouse	2.6	5.1	3.6
Uncertain	0.0	.4	.2
No Pres. or Rec. Spouse	79.6	57.8	70.2

199.

SPOUSE'S YEAR OF BIRTH

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1885 - 1889	0.00	.83	.35
1890 - 1894	0.00	.83	.35
1895 - 1899	0.00	2.91	1.26
1900 - 1904	0.00	1.66	.72
1905 - 1909	0.00	4.17	1.80
1910 - 1914	.62	1.25	.90
1915 - 1919	.93	4.18	2.32
1920 - 1924	.93	6.66	3.40
1925 - 1929	1.25	3.76	2.32
1930 - 1934	2.83	2.91	2.86
1935 - 1939	4.69	5.83	5.18
1940 - 1944	6.88	3.34	5.35
1945 - 1947	.93	.42	.72
Year Uncertain	1.88	4.17	2.86
No Pres. or Rec. Spouse	79.06	57.08	69.64

200.

SPOUSE'S AGE

(At Time of Interview)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
18 - 19	.62	0.00	.36
20 - 24	6.89	4.17	5.71
25 - 29	6.25	5.00	5.71
30 - 34	1.88	3.34	2.51
35 - 39	1.25	5.41	3.03
40 - 44	1.25	5.41	3.03
45 - 49	.93	2.91	1.79
50 - 54	.62	4.17	2.15
55 - 59	0.00	3.34	1.43
60 - 64	0.00	1.67	.72
65 - 69	0.00	2.09	.90
70 - 74	0.00	1.67	.72
75 - 79	0.00	.83	.36
Uncertain	1.25	2.92	1.96
No Pres. or Rec. Spouse	79.06	57.08	69.64

201.

SPOUSE'S AGE REL. TO PT.

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Spouse Same Age	3.2	5.5	4.2
Sp. 2 - 6 Yrs. Older	2.6	8.0	4.9
Sp. 7 - 15 Yrs. Older	1.3	9.7	4.9
Sp. 16 + Yrs. Older	.3	5.9	2.7
Spouse 2 - 6 Yrs. Younger	7.7	6.3	7.1
Sp. 7 - 15 Yrs. Younger	3.5	5.1	4.2
Sp. 16 + Yrs. Younger	1.3	.4	.9
Unclear	.6	1.3	.9
No Pres. or Rec. Spouse	79.6	57.8	70.2

202.

SPOUSE'S MARRIAGES

(No. of Prior Marriages)

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One Prior Marriage	3.2	15.2	8.4
Two Prior Marriages	.3	2.1	1.1
Three Prior Marriages	0.0	1.3	.5
Sp. Not Married Before	16.0	22.4	18.7
Uncertain	1.0	1.3	1.1
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

203.

SPOUSE PRIOR MAR. STATUS

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Single	15.7	21.5	18.2
Widowed	.3	5.9	2.7
Divorced	2.9	11.0	6.4
Com-Law Mar. Ended	0.0	.4	.2
Separated	0.0	1.3	.5
Pre-Adm. Sp. (Single)	.3	.8	.5
Unclear	1.3	1.3	1.3
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

204. SPOUSE'S ETHNICITY m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Yankee	10.94	25.00	16.96
French Canadian	4.69	9.58	6.79
Anglo Canadian	0.00	.42	.18
Scotch	.31	0.00	.18
Polish	0.00	.42	.18
American Mix.	.63	.42	.54
American Jew	.31	.42	.36
Italian & Amer.	0.00	.83	.36
Irish-American	.63	2.08	1.251
Irish & French	0.00	.42	.18
American Negro	.31	0.00	.18
American Indian	0.00	.42	.18
American & Indian	0.00	.42	.18
Unclear	3.13	2.50	2.86
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

205. SPOUSE'S RELIGION m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Atheist, Agnostic	.63	2.50	1.43
Catholic	6.25	11.67	8.57
Jewish	.31	.42	.36
Protestant, Unspecif.	5.94	14.17	9.46
Prot. Moderate	5.00	11.67	7.86
Prot. Fundamentalist	1.25	.42	.89
Unclear	1.56	2.08	1.79
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

206. SPOUSE SOC. CLASS LEVEL s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Middle	.6	.8	.7
Lower Middle	1.0	2.5	1.6
Lower	10.2	22.4	15.5
Lower to Nadir	7.3	15.2	10.7
Nadir	0.0	.8	.4
Unclear	1.3	.4	.9
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

207. SPOUSE RUR.-URBAN TYPE s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Maritime	0.0	.4	.2
Rural	1.9	5.9	3.6
Village	.3	1.7	.9
Town	3.8	3.4	3.6
Rural & Urban	.3	.8	.5
Urban	4.5	9.3	6.5
Unclear	9.6	20.7	14.4
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

208. SPOUSE'S EDUCATION m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
0 to 4th Grade	.31	3.75	1.79
4th to 8th Grade	1.88	6.25	3.75
Grammar School Complete	3.13	10.83	6.43
Hi. School Incomplete	4.06	5.00	4.46
Hi. School Complete	2.81	4.58	3.57
Trade School, Jr. Col. etc.	.63	.83	.71
College Completion	.31	0.00	.18
Pineland Education	5.31	7.92	6.43
School for the Deaf	0.00	.42	.18
Unclear	2.50	3.33	2.86
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

209. SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Now Employed	8.0	31.6	18.2
Past Employ, Not Now	.3	8.0	3.6
Never Employed	.3	1.3	.7
Housewife Role	10.5	0.0	6.0
Unclear	1.3	1.3	1.3
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

210. REASON FOR UNEMPLOYMENT (Of Spouse - Table 209) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Retired	0.00	2.92	1.25
Sickness	0.00	.83	.36
Physically Disabled	0.00	2.50	1.07
Mental Handicap	.31	0.00	.18
Incarcerated	0.00	.42	.18
Seasonal Work	.31	.83	.54
Unemployment	0.00	1.67	.71
Housewife Seeking Work	1.25	0.00	.71
Spouse is Employed	8.44	31.25	18.21
Housewife Role	9.06	0.00	5.18
Unclear	1.56	2.60	1.96
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

211. SPOUSE INCOME PER MONTH (From all Sources) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Income	10.00	1.67	6.42
Covered in Other $/Time	.63	.42	.54
$ 20 - 39	.31	.42	.36
40 - 59	.63	0.00	.36
60 - 79	.31	.83	.54
80 - 99	.63	1.67	1.07
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
100 - 124	0.00	1.25	.54
125 - 149	0.00	.42	.18
150 - 174	.94	4.58	2.50
" - " *	.31	.42	.36
175 - 199	.63	1.67	1.07
200 - 224	.63	4.58	2.32
225 - 249	.63	2.91	1.60
250 - 274	.31	3.33	1.60
275 - 299	.31	2.08	1.07
300 - 324	.63	5.00	2.50
325 - 349	0.00	1.25	.54
350 - 374	0.00	.83	.36
375 - 399	0.00	.42	.18
400 - 424	0.00	.83	.36
425 - 449	.31	2.50	1.25
475 - 499	.31	0.00	.18
500 - 524	0.00	.42	.18
" - " *	0.00	.42	.18
Unclear	3.13	5.00	3.92
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

* Net Income. (Income without asterisk is gross income.)

212.

SPOUSE ANNUAL INCOME

(Last 1 Yr. All Sources)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Income	10.00	1.67	6.42
$ 1 - $ 499	.31	.42	.36
500 - 999	1.25	.83	1.07
1,000 - 1,499	.63	2.91	1.60
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
1,500 - 1,999	.94	2.91	1.78
2,000 - 2,499	.63	5.41	2.67
" - " *	.31	.42	.36
2,500 - 2,999	1.25	6.66	3.57
3,000 - 3,499	.31	5.00	2.32
3,500 - 3,999	.94	5.00	2.67
4,000 - 4,499	0.00	2.50	1.07
4,500 - 4,999	0.00	.83	.36
5,000 - 5,499	.31	2.50	1.25
5,500 - 5,999	.63	0.00	.36
6,000 - 6,499	0.00	0.00	0.00
" - " *	0.00	.42	.18
6,500 - 6,999	0.00	.42	.18
7,000 - 7,999	0.00	0.00	0.00
8,000 - 8,999	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unclear	3.13	5.00	3.92
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.06	57.08	69.64

* Net Income. (Income without asterisk is gross income.)

213.

SPOUSE INCOME SOURCE

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Income	10.2	1.7	6.5
Job	7.7	32.9	18.5
Earned Jointly w. Pt.	.3	0.0	.2
Own Business	.3	.8	.5
Retirement (Soc. Sec. etc.)	0.0	1.3	.5
Pension	0.0	3.0	1.3
Disability Payments	.3	1.3	.7
Savings	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unclear	1.6	1.3	1.5
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

214.

SPOUSE FROM PINELAND

(Also A Dischargee)

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Pineland Dischargee	5.4	8.0	6.5
Not From Pineland	15.0	33.8	23.1
Uncertain	0.0	.4	.2
No Pres. or Rec. Sp.	79.6	57.8	70.2

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
215.			
TIME IN PRESENT DOMICILE (Duration of Stay) s			
30 Days or Less	3.8	5.1	4.4
31 - 90 Days	11.2	11.4	11.3
91 - 180 Days	9.6	8.4	9.1
181 Days - 1 Year	15.0	14.8	14.9
1 - 2 Years	14.4	15.6	14.9
2 - 3 Years	8.0	8.4	8.2
3 - 5 Years	18.8	19.4	19.1
5 - 10 Years	15.7	15.6	15.6
Over 10 Years	1.0	.8	.9
Unclear	2.6	.4	1.6
216.			
ENTRY DATE. PRES. DOMIC. m			
1951	.31	0.00	.18
1952	.63	.83	.71
1953	.31	.42	.36
1954	1.25	.83	1.07
1955	.94	1.25	1.07
1956	1.56	2.50	1.96
1957	1.88	3.33	2.50
1958	5.63	4.17	5.00
1959	6.88	6.25	6.61
1960	11.56	13.75	12.50
1961	11.56	6.67	9.46
1962	10.63	10.42	10.54
1963	13.44	15.83	14.46
1964	17.19	20.83	18.75
1965	11.88	12.08	11.96
1966	2.19	0.00	1.25
Unclear	2.19	.83	1.61

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
217.			
CUSTODIAL RESIDENCE (Wholly or Partially) s			
Custodial Residence	21.7	19.8	20.9
No Custod. Resid.	77.3	79.7	78.4
Unclear	1.0	.4	.7
218.			
TYPE OF CUSTODIAL RESID. (Wholly or Partially) m			
Boarding Home	5.31	9.17	6.96
Nursing Home	.31	2.08	1.07
Salvation Army Res.	.63	0.00	.36
School for the Blind	.31	0.00	.18
General Hospital	.31	.83	.54
Mental Hospital	3.44	2.92	3.21
Pineland, Readmission	2.81	2.08	2.50
Other Retard. Center	2.81	1.25	2.14
Correctional	5.63	1.25	3.75
No Custod. Residence	77.19	80.00	78.39
Unclear	1.25	.42	.89
219.			
INDEPENDENTLY DOMICILED s			
Independently Domiciled	35.1	46.8	40.2
Partially	3.2	1.3	2.4
Not Independ. Dom.	60.7	51.5	56.7
Unclear	1.0	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
220.			
TYPE OF HOUSING (Structuring)			
m			
Room	6.88	4.58	5.89
Rooms (Apartment)	31.25	34.58	32.68
House	40.94	48.75	44.29
Trailer	2.19	2.92	2.50
Doesn't Apply (Custod. etc)	16.25	8.33	12.86
Unknown	2.50	.83	1.79

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
221.			
TYPE OF HOUSING (Soc. Class Level)			
s			
Upper	.3	0.0	.2
Upper Middle	.3	1.7	.9
Middle	8.0	9.7	8.7
Lower Middle	15.3	23.6	18.9
Lower	29.1	30.0	29.5
Lower to Nadir	22.7	22.8	22.7
Nadir	2.9	1.7	2.4
Doesn't Apply (Custod. etc)	16.6	8.4	13.1
Unknown	4.8	2.1	3.6

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
222.			
HOUSING FINANCES			
m			
Rental Housing			
Standard Commercial	25.00	30.83	27.50
Shares Cost w. Others	1.88	2.08	1.96
Pays Close Rel. (Owner)	3.75	.83	2.50
Pays O. Relative	2.81	.42	1.79
Pays Rm & Bd to Emplyr	0.00	1.25	.54
Pays Rm & Bd to Priv. Fam.	2.81	.42	1.79
Pays "In Kind"	0.00	.42	.18
To Rel., Part Charity	.31	.42	.36
To Non-Rel. P. Char.	.31	0.00	.18
Rels. Pt. is with Pay Rent	5.00	2.08	3.75
Pt. Spouse to Sp's Rel.	0.00	.83	.36
Spouse's Rel. Pays Rent	0.00	.42	.18
Rent Free			
Pt's Job Benefit	10.94	15.83	13.04
Pt's Spouse's Job Ben.	0.00	1.25	.54
Non-Rel's Charity	1.88	.42	1.25
Owned			
By Pt. or Spouse	5.00	10.83	7.50
By Close Relative	10.31	4.17	7.68
By Distant Rel.	.63	0.00	.36
O.A.A., A.D.			
Commercial Home	5.94	11.25	8.21
W. Rels. or Friends	5.31	7.50	6.25
Doesn't Apply (Custod.)	16.25	8.33	12.86
Unknown	1.88	.42	1.25

223.

PROTECT. HOUSED W. REL.
(Dependent or Semi-Dep.)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Prot. Hsd. w. Relatives	27.5	15.2	22.2
Ditto, Rel. Also Emplyr.	1.3	.4	.9
Not So Housed	55.6	75.9	64.4
Doesn't Apply (Custod.)	15.7	8.4	12.5

224.

PAYS RM. &/OR BD. TO REL.
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Own $, Pays Rel.	11.8	3.4	8.2
OAA, AD etc. to Rel.	6.1	9.7	7.6
Not So Housed or Paid	65.2	78.1	70.7
Doesn't Apply (Custod.)	15.7	8.4	12.5
Unclear	1.3	.4	.9

225.

EMPLOYER'S HOUSING
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Employer's Housing	9.9	15.2	12.2
Emp. Housing, Part Time	.3	.4	.4
Emp. Hsng., Rel. is Emp.	1.3	1.3	1.3
Spouse's Emplyr.	0.0	.8	.4
Not So Housed	71.6	73.4	72.4
Doesn't Apply (Custod.)	15.7	8.4	12.5
Unclear	1.3	.4	.9

226.

OTHER HOUSING
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Rm & Bd, Pays Friend(s)	2.19	.83	1.61
Token Rent to Friend(s)	.31	0.00	.18
No Rent, Helps w. Incidentals	.31	0.00	.18
Hsd. Free w. Friend(s)	.63	.42	.54
Not So Housed (Other)	80.00	90.00	84.29
Doesn't Apply (Custod.)	15.31	8.33	12.32
Unclear	1.25	.42	.89

227.

REGION OF DOMICILE
(Rural-Urban Setting)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Rural & Maritime	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rural	16.3	13.9	15.3
Village	7.7	7.2	7.5
Town	14.4	18.1	16.0
Suburban	5.8	8.0	6.7
Urban	38.3	44.3	40.9
Instit. Setting	15.7	7.6	12.2
Other	0.0	.4	.2
Unclear	1.6	.4	1.1

228. RESIDENCE: USA, NOT MAINE	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
New Hampshire	2.50	1.25	1.96
Vermont	0.00	.83	.36
Massachusetts	5.00	4.17	4.64
Rhode Island	.31	.83	.54
Connecticut	6.25	3.33	5.00
New York	.63	.83	.71
New Jersey	1.25	.42	.89
Pennsylvania	.63	.42	.54
Maryland	.31	0.00	.18
Georgia	0.00	.42	.18
Florida	.63	1.67	1.07
Louisiana	.63	0.00	.36
Ohio	.63	0.00	.36
Missouri	.31	0.00	.18
North Dakota	.31	0.00	.18
South Dakota	.31	0.00	.18
Colorado	0.00	.42	.18
California	1.25	0.00	.71
Not Outside Maine	78.43	85.00	81.25
Unknown	.63	.42	.54

229. RESIDENCE: MAINE COUNTY	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
m			
Androscoggin	14.69	14.58	14.64
Aroostook	3.44	2.50	3.04
Cumberland	17.19	23.33	19.82
Franklin	.94	2.08	1.43
Hancock	1.25	1.67	1.43
Kennebec	8.44	12.50	10.18
Knox	3.44	2.50	3.04
Lincoln	1.88	2.08	1.96
Oxford	3.75	2.08	3.04
Penobscot	8.44	6.67	7.68
Piscataquis	1.88	.42	1.25
Sagadahoc	.63	2.08	1.25
Somerset	3.44	3.33	3.39
Waldo	1.56	2.08	1.79
Washington	3.44	3.33	3.39
York	3.75	3.33	3.57
Not In Maine	21.25	14.58	18.39
Unknown	.63	.83	.71

230. NO. PHYSICAL DOMICILES (Since Discharge)	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
One	18.2	19.0	18.5
Two	20.4	15.2	18.2
Three	14.1	18.6	16.0
Four	9.9	13.5	11.5
Five	8.9	10.1	9.5
Six	8.6	9.7	9.1
Seven	5.4	3.0	4.4
Eight	3.8	3.4	3.6
Nine or More	9.9	7.6	8.9
Unclear	.6	0.0	.4

231.

NO. PERSONNEL DOMICILES
(Since Discharge)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
One	24.6	23.2	24.0
Two	25.2	24.9	25.1
Three	20.1	24.1	21.8
Four	10.5	13.1	11.6
Five	6.1	6.8	6.4
Six	7.0	2.5	5.1
Seven	1.6	2.1	1.8
Eight	1.0	1.7	1.3
Nine or More	3.2	.8	2.2
Unclear	.6	.8	.7

NOTE: Tables 232, 233, & 234, which follow, refer to post-discharge institutionalization that ended before the time of interview. Data on correctional institutions is not covered in these tables, and the term institutionalization is broadened here to include other formal protective environments.

232.

POST-DISCH. INSTIT. HIST.
(Now Ended)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Post-Disch. Instit. Hist.	13.1	8.4	11.1
No Hist. or Now in Instit.	86.2	91.2	88.4
Uncertain	.6	.4	.5

233.

TYPE OF INSTITUTION
(In Table 232)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Boarding Home	.31	0.00	.18
Nursing Home	0.00	.42	.18
T.B. Sanatorium	.63	0.00	.36
General Hospital	.63	2.08	1.25
Mental Hospital	8.44	4.58	6.79
Pineland Readmission	2.19	.42	1.43
O. Retard. Center	.31	.83	.54
Jefferson Camp	.31	0.00	.18
No Hist, or Now in Instit.	86.25	91.25	88.39
Unknown	.94	.42	.72

234.

DURATION OF INSTIT.
(In Table 232)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Less than 30 Days	2.81	.42	1.79
30 - 90 Days	3.13	3.33	3.21
91 - 180 Days	1.88	.42	1.25
181 Days - 1 Year	1.56	.42	1.07
1 - 2 Years	1.25	.42	.89
2 - 3 Years	.94	.83	.89
3 - 5 Years	.31	.42	.36
5 - 10 Years	.31	1.25	.71
10 + Years	.31	0.00	.18
No Hist, or Now in Instit.	86.25	91.25	88.39
Unknown	1.25	1.25	1.25

235.

DOMICILE NETWORK - FORMAL

(Present Location)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Reform School, Maine	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reformatory, Maine	.63	1.25	.90
Maine State Prison	2.81	0.00	1.61
County Jail	.63	0.00	.36
Out of State Prison	1.25	0.00	.71
Federal Penitentiary	.31	0.00	.18
General Hospital	.31	.83	.54
Mental Hospital	3.44	2.92	3.21
Pineland Readmission	2.81	2.08	2.50
O. Retard. Center	2.81	1.25	2.14
Poor Farm	0.00	.42	.18
Salv. Army Shelter	.62	0.00	.36
School for Blind	.31	0.00	.18
Nursing Home	.31	2.08	1.07
Comm. Bdg. Home, 1 Pt.	.94	1.67	1.25
Comm. Bdg. Home, 2-3 Pts.	1.88	.83	1.43
Comm. Bdg. Home, 4-10 Pts.	.31	3.75	1.79
Comm. Bdg. Home, 11+ Pts.	2.50	2.08	2.32
Comm. Bdg. Home, # Unkn.	.31	.42	.36
Military	.94	0.00	.54
Not So Domiciled	75.94	80.00	77.68
Unknown	.94	.42	.71

236.

DOMICILE NETWORK - ELDERS

(Present Location)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Mother & Father	10.63	3.33	7.50
Mother & Step Father	2.50	.42	1.61
Mother Alone	6.56	3.33	5.18
Father & Step Mother	.63	.83	.71
Father Alone	.94	.42	.71
Step Mother Alone	.31	0.00	.18
Foster Mother & Others	.31	0.00	.18
Adopt. Mother & Father	.31	0.00	.18
Grandparents Alone	.63	0.00	.36
Mother, Father & G.Mo.	.63	0.00	.36
Mo, Fa, Aunt, Uncle	.31	0.00	.18
Mo, Step Fa, G.Fa.	.31	0.00	.18
Mo, & G.Mo.	0.00	.42	.18
Mo, Fa, & O. Adult	.31	0.00	.18
Mo, & Fos. Uncle	.31	0.00	.18
Mo, Aunt & Uncle	.31	0.00	.18
Aunts	.31	0.00	.18
Uncle Alone	0.00	.42	.18
Aunt Alone	0.00	.42	.18
Aunt & Uncle(s)	.31	.42	.36
Mo-Law & Fa-Law	.31	0.00	.18
MMo-Law	.63	1.25	.89
Fa-Law	.31	.42	.36
Cousins	0.00	.42	.18
Landlord & Spouse	.63	0.00	.36
Landlord & O. Boarders	.31	0.00	.18
Landlady	.31	0.00	.18
Landlord, L's Sp. & L's Fa.	.63	.42	.54
Landlord	0.00	.42	.18
Elderly Married Couple	.31	0.00	.18
No Such Network	69.06	86.67	76.61
Unknown	1.88	.42	1.25

237.

DOM. NETWORK - PEERS, ETC.
(Incl. Children, Kin)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Doesn't Apply	39.38	35.83	37.86
Solo - No Dom. Network	10.94	8.33	99.82
Legal Spouse	6.56	15.83	10.54
Com-Law Spouse	.31	2.50	1.25
Legal or C-Law Sp & Ch	6.56	11.67	8.75
Op Sex Friend & Ch	.31	0.00	.18
Legal Sp & Sp's Ch	.94	1.25	1.07
Sp, Pt's Sis, Sis's Ch	0.00	.42	.18
Leg Sp & O. Adults	.63	1.67	1.07
Spouse, Ch & O. Adults	1.25	1.25	1.25
Sp, Sp's Ch & Bro-Law	.31	0.00	.18
Spouse, Bro-law, Niece	0.00	.42	.18
Spouse & Co-Employees	.31	0.00	.18
Own Children	0.00	.83	.36
O. Adults & Own Ch	0.00	1.25	.54
Sister	1.56	1.67	1.61
Sis, Sis' Fam & O. Adult	.31	0.00	.18
Sis, Sis' Adult Ch	.31	.83	.54
Sis & Fam & Pt's Own Ch	0.00	.42	.18
Sis, Sis' Sp & Fam	1.88	1.67	1.79
Brother (Adult)	3.13	2.08	2.68
Brothers (Adult)	.63	0.00	.36
Bro, Bro's Sp & Fam	1.56	0.00	.89
Adult Sister(s) & Bro(s)	.94	0.00	.54
Sis, Bro-Law, Bro	.31	.42	.36
Ad & Mnr Sibs &/or ½ Sibs	1.25	0.00	.71
Misc Ad & Mnr Sibs & Rels	.31	0.00	.18
Minor Sibs &/or ½ Sibs	5.63	.83	3.57
Daughter & Da's Fam	0.00	.83	.36
Son (Adult)	0.00	.42	.18
Bro-Law & Fam	.63	0.00	.36
Niece & Fam	0.00	1.25	.54
Nephew	0.00	.42	.18
Nephew & Fam	.31	0.00	.18
Minor Cousins	0.00	.42	.18
O. Relatives	1.25	.42	.89
Friend, Same Sex	2.81	.83	1.96
Friends, Same Sex	.63	0.00	.36
Friends, Same & Op Sex	.31	.42	.36
Mar Couple (Friends)	.31	0.00	.18
Mar Couple & Their Ch	1.25	0.00	.71
Armed Forces	.94	0.00	.54
Co-Employees	4.38	5.00	4.64
Co-Employees, Part Time	.31	.42	.36
Unknown	1.56	.42	1.07

Ch = Child or Children

238.

DOM. NETWORK - EMPLOYER(S)
(& Employer's Kin)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Doesn't Apply	90.31	84.58	87.86
Employer	0.00	4.58	1.96
Supervisor(s)	0.00	.42	.18
Employer & Emp's Spouse	2.50	1.67	2.14
Emp, Emp's Sp & Fam	3.13	5.83	4.29
Emp & Emp's Son(s)	.31	0.00	.18
Emp & Emp's Daughter(s)	.31	0.00	.18
Emp & Emp's Sibs	.63	0.00	.36
Employer's Son & Da	0.00	.42	.18
Emp Who is Relative	1.25	.83	1.07
Emp & O. Adult(s)	0.00	1.25	.54
Ex-Employer & Family	.31	0.00	.18
Unknown	1.25	.42	.89

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
239.			
NUMBER OF DIFF. JOBS (Held Since Discharge)			
m			
One	10.63	18.75	14.10
Two	13.75	13.75	13.75
Three	8.44	15.00	11.25
Four	4.69	7.08	5.71
Five	7.19	4.58	6.07
Six	5.94	6.67	6.25
Seven	3.75	2.08	3.04
Eight	2.19	2.50	2.32
Nine	3.13	0.00	1.79
Ten	2.50	.42	1.61
Eleven	.31	.42	.36
Twelve	1.56	0.00	.89
Thirteen	.31	0.00	.18
Fourteen	.31	.42	.36
Fifteen or More	3.13	.42	1.96
1 Regular + Mixed Odd Jobs	1.56	.42	1.07
2 " " " "	.63	.42	.54
3 " " " "	1.25	0.00	.71
4 " " " "	0.00	.42	.18
5 " " " "	.31	0.00	.18
6 " " " "	.63	0.00	.36
7 " " " "	.31	0.00	.18
2 Reg. + Part Moonlighting	.31	.42	.36
4 " " "	.31	0.00	.18
5 " " "	0.00	.42	.18
6 " " "	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply	25.31	25.42	25.35
Unknown	1.25	.42	.89

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
240.			
PRESENT OR LAST JOB			
s			
Present Job	51.8	42.2	47.6
Last Job, Within Last Yr.	12.8	10.1	11.6
Last Job, Over 1 Yr. Ago	8.9	21.5	14.4
Doesn't Apply	25.9	25.7	25.8
Unknown	.6	.4	.5
241.			
DURATION OF JOB (Present or Last)			
m			
Less Than 30 Days	10.00	7.08	8.75
30 - 90 Days	14.06	11.25	12.86
91 - 180 Days	8.44	8.33	8.39
181 Days - 1 Year	8.44	12.50	10.18
Over 1 Year to 2 Years	7.19	9.17	8.04
Over 2 Years to 3 Years	4.06	7.08	5.36
Over 3 Years to 5 Years	9.06	9.17	9.11
Over 5 Years to 10 Years	11.25	7.50	9.64
Over 10 Years	.63	0.00	.36
Doesn't Apply	25.31	25.42	25.35
Unknown	1.56	2.50	1.96
242.			
PRE-DISCHARGE EMPLOYER (Trial Visit Employer)			
s			
Same TV Emp. Since Disch.	5.1	6.8	5.8
Retrn to TV Emp of Dis.	1.0	2.5	1.6
Retrn to Pre-Exit TV Emp.	.3	.8	.5
No TV Emp. & Dsn't Apply	93.6	89.5	91.8
Unknown	0.0	.4	.2

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
243.			
REASON NOT EMPLOYED			
m			
Work As Too Hard	.94	.42	.71
Exploited, Bored	2.19	3.75	2.86
Accident, Sickness	.94	.83	.89
Work Unsat.	1.25	.42	.89
Actions, Looks Unsat.	1.25	0.00	.71
Business Discontinued	.31	.83	.54
Seasonal Work	2.50	.83	1.79
Project Work	0.00	.42	.18
Laid Off Work	1.25	.83	1.07
Got Married (Housewife)	0.00	17.92	7.68
Too Old, Retired	.31	.83	.54
Chronic Disability	6.56	5.00	5.89
Boarding Home (AD, OAA)	10.94	15.00	12.68
"Needed at Home"	0.00	.83	.36
Severe Sickness in Fam.	0.00	.42	.18
Jailed	1.25	0.00	.71
Refty. (After Emplyment)	4.69	.42	2.86
Ment. Hosp. (Aft. Employment)	1.25	.83	1.07
Other (Aft. Employment)	.63	0.00	.36
Fatal Illness, Accident	1.25	.83	1.07
Doesn't Apply	61.25	49.17	56.07
Unknown	1.25	.42	.89

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
244.			
CHANNELS TO EMPLOYMENT (Present or Last Job)			
m			
Own Initiative	39.38	38.33	38.93
Answered Want Ad, etc.	.94	.42	.71
Family Initiative - Gen'l	7.19	5.00	6.25
Family Business, Farm	1.25	1.25	1.25
Fam. Membr Place of Work	4.06	.42	2.50
Frnds, Neighbors Initiat.	5.00	3.75	4.46
Acquaintances Initiat.	0.00	.42	.18
Emplymnt Serv, Priv, Govt	1.88	2.50	2.14
Minister	.31	0.00	.18
Pineland, Pre-Discharge	6.25	12.92	9.11
Pine. Post-Disch. Service	.31	2.08	1.07
Present Emplyr. Initiat.	1.56	1.67	1.61
Prior Emplyr. Assistance	1.88	4.17	2.86
Parole Officer	1.56	0.00	.89
Social Agency	.31	0.00	.18
Soc. Work, O. Hosp. or Inst.	.31	.42	.36
Drafted	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply	24.69	25.42	25.00
Unknown	2.81	1.25	2.14

245.

CHANNELS TO EMPLOYMENT
(In Addit. to Table 244)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Own Initiative	.94	1.67	1.25
Answered Want Ad, etc.	2.19	4.58	3.21
Family Initiative - Gen'l	5.31	2.50	4.11
Family Business, Farm	.31	0.00	.18
Fam. Membr Place of Work	1.56	.42	1.07
Frnds, Neighbors Initiat.	7.81	3.75	6.07
Emplymnt Serv, Priv, Govt.	4.38	3.33	3.93
Pineland, Pre-Discharge	0.00	.83	.36
Pine. Post-Disch. Service	0.00	.42	.18
Present Emplyr. Initiat.	0.00	.83	.36
Prior Emplyr. Assistance	0.00	.42	.18
Parole Officer	.31	0.00	.18
Social Agency	.31	0.00	.18
Soc. Work, O. Hosp. or Inst.	0.00	.42	.18
Doesn't Apply	24.69	25.42	25.00
No O. Channel	52.18	55.42	53.57

246.

WORK RATING
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	8.44	11.67	9.82
Good	37.81	40.42	38.93
Average	12.50	13.75	13.04
Fair	10.00	5.83	8.21
Poor	4.06	.42	2.50
Doesn't Apply	24.69	25.83	25.18
Unknown	2.50	2.08	2.32

247.

RATER FOR TABLE 246
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Employer	14.7	19.8	16.9
Social Worker	.3	.4	.4
"Person in Charge"	.3	0.0	.2
Dischargee	14.4	18.1	16.0
Interviewer Estimate	19.8	18.6	19.3
Relative or Intimate	22.4	15.6	19.5
Other	.3	0.0	.2
Doesn't Apply	25.2	25.7	25.5
Unknown	2.6	1.7	2.2

248.

WORK RATING
(In Addit. to Table 246)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	3.75	6.67	5.00
Good	22.81	25.42	23.93
Average	9.69	7.92	8.93
Fair	7.19	5.42	6.43
Poor	1.88	.42	1.25
Zero	0.00	.42	.18
Doesn't Apply or No Other	51.88	51.67	51.79
Unknown	2.81	2.08	2.50

249. RATER FOR TABLE 248 s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Employer	0.0	.4	.2
Social Worker	0.0	.4	.2
"Person in Charge"	0.0	.4	.2
Dischargee	2.9	5.1	3.8
Interviewer Estimate	38.7	38.0	38.4
Relative or Intimate	2.9	1.7	2.4
Doesn't Apply or No Other	52.7	52.3	52.5
Unknown	2.9	1.7	2.4

250. FORMAL TRAINING (Since Discharge) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Trainable Classes	2.19	1.25	1.79
Academic	3.13	1.25	2.32
Vocational	1.88	1.67	1.79
Religious	0.00	.42	.18
None Undertaken	85.94	89.17	87.32
Doesn't Apply	6.25	5.83	6.07
Unknown	.63	.42	.54

251. INFORMAL TRAINING (On the Job Type) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Slight Training	45.0	57.4	50.4
Moderate Training	23.3	13.9	19.3
Considerable Training	3.2	2.1	2.7
No Training	1.6	.4	1.1
Doesn't Apply	25.2	25.7	25.5
Unknown	1.6	.4	1.1

252. FORMAL AGENCY SUPPORT s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Sole Source	10.2	14.8	12.2
Main, Primary Source	4.8	8.4	6.4
One of 2 Equal Sources	1.9	4.6	3.1
Secondary Source	3.5	4.6	4.0
Not a Source	63.9	59.9	62.2
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.4	.7

253. OTHER INDIVIDUALS' SUPPORT (Of Dischargee) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Sole Source	4.8	1.7	3.4
Main, Primary Source	4.5	1.7	3.3
One of 2 Equal Sources	4.5	3.4	4.0
Secondary Source	5.1	6.3	5.6
Not a Source	65.5	79.3	71.4
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.4	.7

254. SELF SUPPORT (By Dischargee) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Sole Source	40.9	25.7	34.2
Main, Primary Source	9.3	4.6	7.3
One of 2 Equal Sources	7.0	9.7	8.2
Secondary Source	8.0	12.2	9.8
Not a Source	19.2	40.1	28.4
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
255.			
COOPERAT. SELF SUPPORT			
(By Dischargee W. Others)			
s			
Sole Source	.6	11.4	5.3
Main, Primary Source	0.0	9.7	4.2
One of 2 Equal Sources	3.5	10.5	6.5
Secondary Source	5.1	3.8	4.5
Not A Source	75.1	56.5	67.1
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.8	.9

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
256.			
OTHER SUPPORT: TYPE			
s			
V.A. Pension	.6	.4	.5
Trust Fund	.3	.8	.5
Injury Compensation	.3	0.0	.2
Savings	.3	.8	.5
Alimony	0.0	.8	.4
No Other Sources	82.7	89.5	85.6
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
257.			
OTHER SUPPORT: DEGREE			
(Of Table 256)			
s			
Sole Source	0.0	0.0	0.0
Main, Primary Source	.3	0.0	.2
One of 2 Equal Sources	.6	.4	.5
Secondary Source	.6	2.5	1.5
Not a Source	82.7	89.5	85.6
Doesn't Apply	14.7	7.2	11.5
Unknown	1.0	.4	.7

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
258.			
SUPPORTING PERSONS			
m			
Mother & Father	8.13	1.67	5.36
Mother & Step Father	1.88	.83	1.43
Father & Step Mother	.31	.83	.54
Mother Alone	2.19	1.25	1.79
Father Alone	.63	0.00	.36
Close Relative	0.00	1.25	.54
Sister, or Sis & Sis' Fam	1.88	1.67	1.79
Brother, or Bro & Br Fam	.31	.42	.36
Daughter, or Da & Da Fam	0.00	.83	.36
Aunt & Uncle	.63	.83	.71
Niece or Nephew	.31	0.00	.18
Friends	1.25	1.25	1.25
Employer	0.00	.42	.18
Ex-Landlord	.31	0.00	.18
Husband re Housewife	0.00	24.17	10.36
Divorced Spouse	0.00	.83	.36
Misc. In-Laws	1.25	.42	.90
No Supporting Persons	65.63	55.83	61.43
Doesn't Apply	14.38	7.08	11.25
Unknown	.94	.42	.71

259.

TYPES OF SUPPORT
(From Supp. Persons)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Total Support	4.69	2.08	3.57
Room, Board, Clothing	1.56	.42	1.07
Partial Rm, Brd, Clothing	.63	.83	.71
Partial Maintenance	2.81	3.75	3.21
Room & Board	5.00	1.67	3.57
Room & Clothing	.31	0.00	.18
Room	.94	.83	.89
Board	.31	0.00	.18
Clothing	2.81	2.08	2.50
Medical	0.00	.42	.18
Incidentals	0.00	.42	.18
Husband re Housewife	0.00	23.33	10.00
Alimony	0.00	.83	.36
Doesn't Apply	80.00	62.92	72.68
Unknown	.94	.42	.71

260.

WORK CONDITIONS
(Social Aspects)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Works Mostly Alone	5.00	19.58	11.25
Works Mostly w. Others	62.81	32.92	50.00
Own Business	.63	0.00	.36
Doesn't Apply	30.31	47.08	37.50
Unknown	1.25	.42	.89

261.

WORK: TEMPORAL ASPECTS
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Full Time Single Job	48.75	40.00	45.00
F.T. Sing. Job + Odd Jobs	3.75	.42	2.32
Part Time	1.56	2.92	2.14
Seasonal	4.69	2.50	3.75
Odd Jobs Full Time	1.88	1.25	1.61
Odd Jobs Marginal	3.13	5.00	3.93
Part Time + Marg Odd Jobs	4.06	.42	2.50
Full Time for Handicapd	.63	0.00	.36
Doesn't Apply	30.31	47.08	37.50
Unknown	1.25	.42	.89

262.

SEEKING WORK
(If Not Working Now)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Seeks Work Assiduously	1.0	.8	.9
Seeks Work Somewhat	7.3	4.2	6.0
Not Seeking Work	5.1	25.3	13.8
Works or is Unemployable	83.4	69.2	77.3
Unknown	3.2	.4	2.0

263.

TYPE OF WORK

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Factory Work	20.94	9.17	15.89
Light Store Work	1.88	.42	1.25
Sales	0.00	.42	.18
Cook, Chef's Helper, etc.	.94	0.00	.54
Dishwashing, Kitchen Work	7.19	2.92	5.36
Waitress, Waiter	0.00	.83	.36
Laundry Work	.63	2.50	1.43
Domestic Work	.31	32.08	13.93
Nursing-Aide, Pract., etc.	.31	4.17	1.96
Agricult, Farming	12.50	0.00	7.14
Fruit Picker	.31	0.00	.18
Truck Gardening	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greenhouse Work	.31	0.00	.18
Fishing	.31	0.00	.18
Woodsman, Lumbering	1.88	0.00	1.07
Forestry	.31	0.00	.18
Landscaping	.31	0.00	.18
Groundwork	.94	0.00	.54
Janitor, Caretaker	6.88	0.00	3.93
Service, Bellhop, etc.	.63	0.00	.36
Bartender	0.00	0.00	0.00
Construction Work	2.50	0.00	1.43
Painter	2.19	0.00	1.25
Welder	.63	0.00	.36
Mason's Helper	0.00	0.00	0.00
Brickyard	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slaughterhouse	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mechanic	.94	0.00	.54
Septic Tank Cleaning	.63	0.00	.36
Truck Driver (or Helper)	.63	0.00	.36
Junk, Rubbish Collection	1.57	0.00	.90
Road Maintenance	.31	0.00	.18
Loading, Moving	3.13	0.00	1.79
Gen'l Labor	4.69	0.00	2.68
Salv. Army Helper	.63	0.00	.36
Military	.63	0.00	.36
Merchant Marine	.31	0.00	.18
Housewife	0.00	16.67	7.14
Housework in Home (No $)	0.00	1.25	.54
Baby Sitting, Child Care	0.00	3.75	1.61
Chambermaid	0.00	.83	.36
Seamstress	0.00	.42	.18
Cashier	0.00	.42	.18
Beautician	0.00	0.00	0.00
School Patrol	0.00	.42	.18
Sorting, Assembling	0.00	.42	.18
Doesn't Apply	23.75	23.33	23.57
Unknown	.94	0.00	.54

264.

TYPE OF WORK
(In Addit. to Table 263)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Factory Work	1.56	.42	1.07
Light Store Work	0.00	.42	.18
Sales	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cook, Chef's Helper, etc.	.31	.42	.36
Dishwashing, Kitchen Work	2.19	.42	1.43
Waitress, Waiter	.63	.83	.71
Laundry Work	0.00	0.00	0.00
Domestic Work	.31	2.08	1.07
Nursing-Aide, Pract. etc.	0.00	2.08	.89
Agricult, Farming	1.88	0.00	1.07
Fruit Picker	.31	0.00	.18
Truck Gardening	.31	0.00	.18
Greenhouse Work	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fishing	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodsman, Lumbering	1.25	0.00	.71
Forestry	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00
Groundswork	3.44	0.00	1.96
Janitor, Caretaker	2.19	0.00	1.25
Service, Bellhop, etc.	.31	0.00	.18
Bartender	.63	0.00	.36
Construction Work	.31	0.00	.18
Painter	.94	0.00	.54
Welder	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mason's Helper	.63	0.00	.36
Brickyard	.31	0.00	.18
Slaughterhouse	.31	0.00	.18
Mechanic	.31	0.00	.18
Septic Tank Cleaning	.31	0.00	.18
Truck Driver (or Helper)	.63	0.00	.36
Junk, Rubbish Collection	.63	0.00	.36
Road Maintenance	0.00	0.00	0.00
Loading, Moving	1.25	0.00	.71
Gen'l Labor	2.50	0.00	1.43
Salv. Army Helper	0.00	0.00	0.00
Military	0.00	0.00	0.00
Merchant Marine	0.00	0.00	0.00
Housewife	0.00	8.75	3.75
Housework in Home (No $)	0.00	.83	.36
Baby Sitting, Child Care	0.00	7.08	3.04
Chambermaid	0.00	0.00	0.00
Seamstress	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cashier	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beautician	0.00	.42	.18
School Patrol	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sorting, Assembling	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Addit. Type of Work	51.25	52.92	51.97
Doesn't Apply	23.75	23.33	23.57
Unknown	1.56	0.00	.89

265.

WORK LOCATION

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Own Home, Sheltered	0.00	1.25	.54
Own Home, Semi-Shelt.	0.00	1.25	.54
O. Sheltered Work	1.25	1.25	1.25
With Community Contact	6.25	21.67	12.86
Housewife	0.00	17.92	7.68
Business of Rel. or Frnd.	2.19	.42	1.43
Priv. Bus. or Work	58.13	26.25	44.46
Own Priv. Bus.	.94	0.00	.54
Doesn't Apply	30.63	29.58	30.18
Unknown	.63	.42	.54

266.

WORK LOCATION

(In Addit. to Table 265)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Own Home, Sheltered	0.00	0.00	0.00
Own Home, Semi-Shelt.	0.00	0.00	0.00
O. Sheltered Work	0.00	0.00	0.00
With Community Contact	5.31	3.33	4.46
Housewife	0.00	9.58	4.11
Business of Rel. or Frnd.	.31	0.00	.18
Priv. Bus. or Work	2.82	1.25	2.14
Own Priv. Bus.	.31	0.00	.18
No Add'l Work Locat.	60.00	55.84	58.21
Doesn't Apply	30.63	29.58	30.18
Unknown	.63	.42	.54

267.

EARNINGS PER WEEK

(Maximum Gross)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Wages in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 5 or Less	3.44	2.08	2.86
$ 6 to $ 9	.94	.83	.89
10 - 19	5.94	15.42	10.00
20 - 39	6.25	10.42	8.04
40 - 59	23.13	14.17	19.29
60 - 79	11.88	4.17	8.57
80 - 99	5.94	.83	3.75
100 - 124	3.75	.42	2.32
125 - 149	.94	.42	.71
150 - 174	.31	0.00	.18
Covered in Other $/Time	1.56	2.50	1.96
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	2.81	.42	1.79

268.

EARNING PER WEEK

(Maximum Net)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Wages in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 5 or Less	3.44	2.08	2.86
$ 6 to $ 9	.94	1.25	1.07
10 - 19	7.19	15.42	10.71
20 - 39	11.25	14.58	12.68
40 - 59	22.81	12.50	18.39
60 - 79	9.69	1.67	6.25
80 - 99	4.06	.83	2.68
100 - 124	1.88	0.00	1.07
125 - 149	.31	.42	.36
Covered in Other $/Time	1.56	2.50	1.96
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	3.75	.42	2.33

269.

EARNINGS PER WEEK
(Minimum Gross)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Wages in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 5 or Less	5.63	3.75	4.82
$ 6 to $ 9	.94	.83	.89
10 - 19	9.69	16.67	12.68
20 - 39	11.56	11.67	11.61
40 - 59	18.75	10.42	15.18
60 - 79	8.44	2.50	5.89
80 - 99	3.44	.83	2.32
100 - 124	.94	0.00	.54
125 - 149	.31	.42	.36
Covered in Other $/Time	1.56	2.50	1.96
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	5.62	2.08	4.11

270.

EARNINGS PER WEEK
(Minimum Net)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Wages in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 5 or Less	5.63	3.75	4.82
$ 6 to $ 9	.94	1.25	1.07
10 - 19	10.63	16.67	13.21
20 - 39	17.19	16.25	16.79
40 - 59	16.88	7.08	12.68
60 - 79	5.63	1.67	3.93
80 - 99	1.88	0.00	1.07
100 - 124	.63	0.00	.36
125 - 149	0.00	.42	.18
Covered in Other $/Time	1.56	2.50	1.96
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	5.94	2.08	4.29

271.

EARNINGS PER MONTH
(Gross, Except *)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Income in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 5 or Less	0.00	0.00	0.00
$ 6 to $ 9	.94	.83	.89
10 - 19	1.25	.42	.89
20 - 39	2.19	2.08	2.14
40 - 59	4.37	10.42	6.96
60 - 79	3.44	5.83	4.46
80 - 99	2.19	2.50	2.32
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
100 - 124	2.50	3.75	3.04
125 - 149	3.13	2.50	2.85
" - " *	.31	.83	.54
150 - 174	7.19	5.00	6.25
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
175 - 199	3.13	3.33	3.21
200 - 224	7.81	3.33	5.89
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
225 - 249	5.62	2.50	4.28
250 - 274	5.00	2.08	3.75
275 - 299	2.81	1.25	2.14
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
300 - 324	3.44	.83	2.32
325 - 349	.63	0.00	.36
350 - 374	.94	0.00	.54
375 - 399	1.25	.83	1.07
400 - 424	.63	0.00	.36
425 - 449	.94	0.00	.54
450 - 474	.31	0.00	.18
475 - 499	.31	0.00	.18
550 - 574	.63	0.00	.36
600 - 624	0.00	.42	.18
Covered in Other $/Time	2.81	1.67	2.32
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	1.88	1.25	1.61

* Net Income

272.

EARNINGS PER YEAR
(Gross, Except *)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Income in $	1.25	20.42	9.46
$ 1 to $499	8.12	6.66	7.50
500 - 999	8.43	18.75	12.85
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
1,000 - 1,499	8.12	4.58	6.60
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
1,500 - 1,999	7.19	5.41	6.42
" - " *	.31	.83	.54
2,000 - 2,499	7.81	6.25	7.14
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
2,500 - 2,999	8.44	3.33	6.25
3,000 - 3,499	6.88	2.08	4.82
" - " *	.31	0.00	.18
3,500 - 3,999	2.81	1.67	2.32
4,000 - 4,499	1.88	0.00	1.07
4,500 - 4,999	1.88	.42	1.25
5,000 - 5,499	1.56	.42	1.07
5,500 - 5,999	.31	0.00	.18
6,000 - 6,499	0.00	0.00	0.00
6,500 - 6,999	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply	31.88	27.92	30.18
Unknown	1.56	1.25	1.43

* Net Income

273.

MISCEL. JOB BENEFITS
s & m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Room	12.1	17.7	14.5
Board	13.4	22.8	17.5
1 Meal/Day	2.81	7.50	4.82
Insurance	14.7	8.4	12.0
Social Security	49.69	32.08	42.14

NOTE: Above categories are not mutually exclusive.

274.

EXTERNAL SUPPORT
(Ever Rec'd Since Disch.)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Received	64.5	58.2	61.8
Not Received	32.9	39.7	35.8
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	1.9	0.0	1.1

275.

AID TO DISABLED (A.D.)
(Rec'd Since Discharge)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Received at Present	2.9	4.2	3.5
Received in Past	2.2	3.0	2.5
Continuous Since Discharge	4.5	5.5	4.9
Temporarily Stopped	.6	0.0	.4
Never Received	88.8	85.2	87.3
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	.3	0.0	.2

* NOTE:

Rec'd at Present = Aid did not begin until sometime after discharge.

Rec'd in Past = Aid rec'd after discharge but now discontinued.

Cont. Since Disch. = Aid began at discharge & continues thru present.

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
276.			
OLD AGE ASSISTANCE (Rec'd Since Discharge)			
s			
Received at Present	.3	1.3	.7
Received in Past	.3	0.0	.2
Continuous Since Discharge	2.6	5.9	4.0
Never Received	96.2	90.7	93.8
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	0.0	0.0	0.0
277.			
SOCIAL SECUR. DISABILITY (Physical Disability)			
s			
Received at Present	1.0	1.3	1.1
Received in Past	.3	.4	.4
Continuous Since Discharge	0.0	0.0	0.0
Never Received	97.8	96.2	97.1
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	.3	0.0	.2
278.			
SOCIAL SECURITY, OLD AGE			
s			
Received at Present	0.0	.8	.4
Received in Past	0.0	0.0	0.0
Continuous Since Discharge	0.0	.4	.2
Never Received	99.4	96.6	98.2
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	0.0	0.0	0.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
279.			
SOC. SEC. RETARDED CHILD			
s			
Received at Present	2.6	3.4	2.9
Received in Past	.3	.4	.4
Continuous Since Discharge	1.3	2.1	1.6
Never Received	94.2	92.0	93.3
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	1.0	0.0	.5
280.			
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSAT. (State Empl. Security)			
s			
Received at Present	1.0	.8	.9
Received in Past	15.7	8.0	12.4
(Cont. Since Disch.)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Never Received	81.2	88.2	84.2
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	1.6	.8	1.3
281.			
PUBLIC WELFARE (Town, City, State)			
s			
Received at Present	2.9	6.3	4.4
Received in Past	12.1	11.8	12.0
Continuous Since Discharge	.3	.4	.4
Never Received	82.1	78.9	80.7
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	1.9	.4	1.3

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
282.			
ORGANIZED CHARITIES (Salv. Army, etc.)			
s			
Received at Present	.3	0.0	.2
Received in Past	1.0	.8	.9
Continuous Since Discharge	0.0	0.0	0.0
Never Received	96.8	96.6	96.7
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	1.3	.4	.9

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
283.			
INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT (Relatives, Friends, etc.)			
s			
Received at Present	3.5	6.8	4.9
Received in Past	8.6	7.6	8.2
Continuous Since Discharge	6.4	4.2	5.5
Temporarily Stopped	1.6	0.0	.9
Rec'd as Minor, Present	3.5	.4	2.2
Rec'd as Minor, Past	3.2	1.3	2.4
Other	6.4	1.7	4.4
Never Received	63.3	74.3	68.0
Doesn't Apply	.6	2.1	1.3
Uncertain	2.9	1.7	2.4

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
284.			
OTHER TYPES OF SUPPORT			
s			
Jefferson Camp	1.6	0.0	.9
Hospital Aid	.3	1.7	.9
Trust Fund	.6	1.3	.9
Accident Insurance	.6	0.0	.4
Soc. Sec. Minor Child	.3	0.0	.2
Pension (RR, VA, etc)	1.0	1.3	1.1
Aid to Blind	1.0	0.0	.5
Aid Dependent Children	1.3	4.6	2.7
No Other Type	91.7	90.7	91.3
Uncertain	1.6	.4	1.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
285.			
DEGREE OF SUPPORT (In Table 284)			
s			
Received at Present	1.3	5.1	2.9
Received in Past	3.2	2.1	2.7
Continuous Since Discharge	1.3	1.3	1.3
Rec'd as Minor, Past	1.0	.4	.7
No Other Type	91.7	90.7	91.3
Uncertain	1.6	.4	1.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
286.			
WELFARE IN LAST 12 MO. (Town, City, State Welf.)			
m			
Welf. Rec'd in Last 12 Mo.	6.87	11.67	8.93
No Welfare Rec'd	91.25	87.08	89.46
Uncertain	1.88	1.25	1.60

287. CONTINUATION OF WELFARE (In Table 286) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Continues	2.81	6.67	4.46
Has Ended	4.06	5.00	4.47
No Welfare Rec'd	91.25	87.08	89.46
Uncertain	1.88	1.25	1.60

288. DURATION OF WELFARE (In Table 286) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1 - 5 Months	4.69	6.67	5.54
6 - 11 Months	1.25	1.25	1.25
12 - 17 Months	.94	2.50	1.61
No Welfare Received	91.25	87.08	89.46
Uncertain	1.88	2.50	2.15

289. MINIMUM $ PER WEEK (In Table 286) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
$ 1 - $20	5.8	9.7	7.5
21 - 40	1.3	.4	.9
No Welfare Rec'd	91.2	87.0	89.4
Uncertain	1.8	2.9	2.2

290. MAXIMUM $ PER WEEK (In Table 286) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
$ 1 - $20	4.5	7.2	5.6
21 - 40	1.6	2.1	1.8
41 - 60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61 - 80	.3	0.0	.2
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 - 150	0.0	.4	.2
151 - 250	.3	0.0	.2
251 & Over	.3	0.0	.2
No Welfare Rec'd	91.2	87.0	89.4
Uncertain	1.8	3.2	2.4

NOTE: Above figures include medical & hospital expenses.

291. FORM OF WELFARE (In Table 286) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
In Cash	1.0	0.0	.5
In Kind, Services, etc.	5.4	11.4	8.0
Cash, Kind, Services	.6	.4	.5
No Welfare Rec'd	91.2	87.0	89.4
Uncertain	1.8	1.2	1.5

292. ADD'L FORMS OF WELFARE (In Table 286) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Hospital & Medical	2.6	4.6	3.5
Surplus Food	.3	.8	.5
Moving Costs	0.0	.4	.2
No Add'l Form	4.2	5.5	4.7
No Welfare Rec'd	91.2	87.0	89.4
Uncertain	1.8	1.6	1.7

293.

RECIPIENTS OF WELFARE

(In Table 286)

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Dischargee Only	2.6	3.4	2.9
Disch. & Spouse	1.6	1.7	1.6
Disch. & Child(ren)	0.0	2.1	.9
Disch., Sp., & Ch.	2.2	3.8	2.9
Disch. & Parent(s)	.6	.8	.7
No Welfare Rec'd	91.2	87.0	89.4
Uncertain	1.8	1.2	1.5

Tables 294 to 301, which follow, describe types of external support received by dischargees since discharge, with Tables 297 to 301 giving details on the most frequently received types of support. Overall non-receipt, receipt, and multiple receipt (whether simultaneous or otherwise) of support are described in Tables 294 and 295. Unknowns are omitted in Tables 298 to 301.

294.

RECEIPT OF SUPPORT

(Since Discharge)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Support Received	35.94	41.67	38.39
One Type of Support	40.93	35.41	38.58
Two Types of Support	18.44	16.25	17.50
Three Types of Support	4.38	5.42	4.81
Four or More	.31	.83	.54
Unknown	0.00	.42	.18

295.

CONTINUATION OF SUPPORT

(At Time of Interview)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None Now Received	69.07	72.92	70.71
One Type of Support	16.11	17.91	16.80
Two Types of Support	11.69	6.67	10.04
Three or More	3.13	2.08	2.27
Unknown	0.00	.42	.18

296.

TYPES OF SUPPORT REC'D

(Incl. Cont'd & Discont'd)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Support Received	35.94	41.67	38.39
Aid to Disabled	9.68	12.50	10.89
Old Age Assistance	2.81	7.08	4.64
Aid to Blind	.93	0.00	.53
ADC, Disch's Child	.62	4.16	2.14
ADC for Disch, as Minor	.62	.41	.53
Soc. Sec. Disability	.93	1.66	1.25
Soc. Sec. Old Age	0.00	.83	.35
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child	3.43	5.83	4.46
Soc. Sec. Minor Child	.93	0.00	.53
Individ. Sup. to Adult	19.68	17.50	18.75
Individ. Sup to Minor	6.87	1.66	4.64
Individ. Sup: Mnr & Adult	5.93	1.66	4.10
Unemployment Compensat.	16.56	8.75	13.21
Public Welfare	15.62	18.33	16.78
Organized Charities	1.87	.83	1.42
Trust Fund	1.25	.83	1.07
Pension (RR, VA, etc.)	.93	1.25	1.07
Accident Insurance, etc.	.93	.41	.71
Alimony	0.00	.83	.35
Hospital Aid, etc.	.62	1.66	1.06
Jefferson Camp	1.56	0.00	.89

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
297.			
DURATION OF SUPPORT			
(# Mo's for Major Types)			
m			
Aid to Disabled (A.D.)			
1 Mo.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	.83	.36
3 - 5	.62	0.00	.36
6 - 11	1.25	.83	1.07
12 - 23	0.00	2.08	.89
24 - 59	6.24	6.23	6.23
60 & over	1.55	1.67	1.61
Unknown	0.00	.83	.36
Old Age Assistance			
1 Mo.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00
3 - 5	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 - 11	0.00	.42	.18
12 - 23	.31	0.00	.18
24 - 59	.94	2.08	1.43
60 & over	1.56	4.58	2.86
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child			
1 Mo.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00
3 - 5	.31	0.00	.18
6 - 11	0.00	0.00	0.00
12 - 23	.31	.42	.36
24 - 59	1.26	4.17	2.51
60 & over	.93	.84	.89
Unknown	.63	.42	.54
Unemployment Compensat.			
1 Mo.	1.88	1.67	1.79
2	2.81	0.00	1.61
3 - 5	5.00	4.17	4.64
6 - 11	2.19	2.08	2.14
12 - 23	1.88	.83	1.43
24 - 59	.31	0.00	.18
60 & over	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unknown	2.50	0.00	1.43

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Public Welfare			
1 Mo.	4.69	3.75	4.29
2	.94	1.67	1.25
3 - 5	3.75	4.17	3.92
6 - 11	1.25	1.67	1.43
12 - 23	2.19	1.67	1.96
24 - 59	.31	1.67	.90
60 & over	.94	.42	.72
Unknown	1.56	3.33	2.32
Individ. Sup. to Adult			
1 Mo.	.63	1.25	.89
2	.63	.83	.71
3 - 5	2.50	.83	1.79
6 - 11	2.50	1.25	1.96
12 - 23	2.81	2.92	2.85
24 - 59	2.50	3.76	3.04
60 & over	4.70	3.76	4.29
Unknown	3.44	2.92	3.22
Individ. Sup. to Minor			
1 Mo.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00
3 - 5	.31	0.00	.18
6 - 11	.31	0.00	.18
12 - 23	1.87	.42	1.25
24 - 59	2.20	.42	1.43
60 & over	2.20	.84	1.62
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00
Individ. Sup: Minor & Adult			
1 Mo.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00
3 - 5	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 - 11	0.00	0.00	0.00
12 - 23	0.00	0.00	0.00
24 - 59	1.25	.83	1.07
60 & over	3.76	.83	2.51
Unknown	.94	0.00	.54

298. FORM OF SUPPORT (Major Types of Support) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Aid to Disabled			
In Cash	9.9	11.2	10.5
In Kind, Services, etc.	0.0	.4	.2
Cash, Kind, Services	0.0	.8	.4
Old Age Assistance			
In Cash	2.8	6.7	4.5
In Kind, Services, etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cash, Kind, Services	0.0	.4	.2
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child			
In Cash	3.2	5.9	4.3
In kind, Services, etc.	.3	0.0	.2
Cash, Kind, Services	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployment Compensat.			
In Cash	16.9	8.8	13.4
In Kind, Services, etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cash, Kind, Services	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Welfare			
In Cash	.6	0.0	.4
In Kind, Services, etc.	11.8	17.2	14.1
Cash, Kind, Services	2.5	1.3	2.0
Individ. Sup. to Adult			
In Cash	.6	1.2	.9
In Kind, Services, etc.	15.0	13.5	14.3
Cash, Kind, Services	4.5	3.0	3.8
Individ. Sup. to Minor			
In Cash	0.0	0.0	0.0
In Kind, Services, etc.	6.0	1.6	4.1
Cash, Kind, Services	1.0	0.0	.6
Individ. Sup: Minor & Adult			
In Cash	.3	0.0	.2
In Kind, Services, etc.	4.1	1.3	2.9
Cash, Kind, Services	1.6	.4	1.0

299. MINIMUM $ PER WEEK (Major Types of Support) s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Aid to Disabled			
$ 1 - $20	8.9	12.2	10.3
21 - 40	.6	0.0	.4
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Old Age Assistance			
$ 1 - $20	2.8	6.7	4.5
21 - 40	0.0	.4	.2
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child			
$ 1 - $20	3.2	5.9	4.3
21 - 40	0.0	0.0	0.0
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployment Compensat.			
$ 1 - $20	6.7	5.4	6.1
21 - 40	6.1	2.1	4.3
41 & over	.3	0.0	.2
Public Welfare			
$ 1 - $20	13.3	14.8	14.1
21 - 40	1.0	.4	.7
41 & over	.3	.4	.2
Individ. Sup. to Adult			
$ 1 - $20	16.3	14.3	15.4
21 - 40	0.0	0.0	0.0
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Individ. Sup. to Minor			
$ 1 - $20	6.4	1.6	4.3
21 - 40	.3	0.0	.2
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Individ. Sup: Minor & Adult			
$ 1 - $20	5.4	1.7	3.8
21 - 40	0.0	0.0	0.0
41 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
300.			
MAXIMUM $ PER WEEK			
(Major Types of Support)			
s			
Aid To Disabled			
$ 1 - $20	5.7	9.2	7.2
21 - 40	3.8	2.5	3.2
41 - 60	0.0	.4	.2
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Old Age Assistance			
$ 1 - $20	1.5	1.7	1.6
21 - 40	1.3	5.0	2.9
41 - 60	0.0	.4	.2
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child			
$ 1 - $20	3.2	5.9	4.3
21 - 40	0.0	0.0	0.0
41 - 60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployment Compensat.			
$ 1 - $20	4.8	5.0	4.9
21 - 40	7.7	2.5	5.4
41 - 60	.3	0.0	.2
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Welfare			
$ 1 - $20	8.9	10.1	9.5
21 - 40	3.8	3.4	3.6
41 - 60	.3	0.0	.2
61 - 80	.3	0.0	.2
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	1.3	1.6	1.5
Individ. Sup. to Adult			
$ 1 - $20	16.6	14.8	15.8
21 - 40	.6	0.0	.4
41 - 60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	.4	.2
Individ. Sup. to Minor			
$ 1 - $20	6.4	1.2	4.1
21 - 40	.3	0.0	.2
41 - 60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0
Individ. Sup: Minor & Adult			
$ 1 - $20	4.8	1.7	3.5
21 - 40	.6	0.0	.3
41 - 60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61 - 80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0
101 & over	0.0	0.0	0.0

301.

RECIPIENTS OF SUPPORT
(Major Types of Support)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Aid to Disabled			
Dischargee Only	9.9	12.6	11.0
All Others	0.0	0.0	0.0
Old Age Assistance			
Dischargee Only	2.8	7.1	4.7
All Others	0.0	0.0	0.0
Soc. Sec. Retarded Child			
Dischargee Only	3.5	5.5	4.3
Disch. & Parent(s)	0.0	.4	.2
Unemployment Compensat.			
Dischargee Only	16.9	8.8	13.4
All Others	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Welfare			
Dischargee Only	6.0	5.1	5.7
Disch. & Spouse	2.9	3.7	3.3
Disch. & Child(ren)	0.0	1.7	.7
Disch, Sp, & Ch.	4.4	5.1	4.7
Disch. & Parent(s)	2.3	3.0	2.5
Individ. Sup. to Adult			
Dischargee Only	19.8	16.0	18.1
Disch. & Child(ren)	0.0	1.3	.5
Disch, Sp, & Ch.	.3	.4	.4
Individ. Sup. to Minor			
Dischargee Only	7.0	1.7	4.7
All Others	0.0	0.0	0.0
Individ. Sup: Minor & Adult			
Dischargee Only	6.0	1.7	4.1
All Others	0.0	0.0	0.0

302.

DOMICILIARY BEHAVIOR
(I. Disch. Toward Others)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	10.5	13.1	11.6
Essentially Good	25.6	23.6	24.7
Good to Medium	10.2	9.7	10.0
Fair at Best	5.4	1.7	3.8
Very Difficult	.6	.4	.5
Lives Solo	10.5	8.0	9.5
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	22.7	35.4	28.2

(As reported by other(s) in Domicile)

303.

DOMICILIARY BEHAVIOR
(II. Disch. Toward Others)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	8.6	11.8	10.0
Essentially Good	27.8	40.1	33.1
Good to Medium	16.0	16.0	16.0
Fair at Best	9.9	3.4	7.1
Very Difficult	.3	.4	.4
Lives Solo	10.5	8.0	9.5
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	12.5	12.2	12.4

(Interviewer's estimate)

304.

DOMICILIARY BEHAVIOR
(I. Others Toward Disch.)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	6.4	11.8	8.7
Essentially Good	18.5	32.1	24.4
Good to Medium	1.3	3.4	2.2
Fair at Best	.6	3.0	1.6
Very Difficult	.3	.8	.5
Lives Solo	10.5	8.0	9.5
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	47.9	32.9	41.5

(As reported by dischargee)

305.

DOMICILIARY BEHAVIOR
(II. Others Toward Disch.)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Excellent	8.0	13.9	10.5
Essentially Good	32.9	41.4	36.5
Good to Medium	14.4	11.0	12.9
Fair at Best	6.7	7.2	6.9
Very Difficult	1.6	1.3	1.5
Lives Solo	10.5	8.0	9.5
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	11.5	9.3	10.5

(Interviewer's estimate)

306.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES: I
(In the Home)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Television, Radio	34.5	35.4	34.9
Books, Papers, Magazines	.6	.8	.7
Toys, Dolls	0.0	0.0	0.0
TV etc. + Books etc.	42.2	51.1	46.0
TV etc. + Toys, etc.	4.5	2.1	3.5
Books etc. + Toys etc.	0.0	0.0	0.0
TV etc. + Books etc. + Toys	1.6	1.7	1.6
Doesn't Apply or None	15.3	8.4	12.4
Unknown	1.3	.4	.9

307.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES: II
(In the Home)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Games, Puzzles, etc.	16.9	5.5	12.0
Hobbies	14.1	3.4	9.5
Sewing, Embroidery, etc.	0.0	33.8	14.5
Games, etc. + Hobbies	13.4	3.0	8.9
Games, etc. + Sewing, etc.	.6	19.0	8.5
Hobbies + Sewing, etc.	1.0	8.0	4.0
Games + Hobbies + Sewing	.3	5.9	2.7
Doesn't Apply or None	51.1	19.4	37.5
Unknown	2.6	2.1	2.4

308.

SOCIALIZING IN THE HOME

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Socializes Generally	80.2	90.7	84.7
Limited, Selective	2.9	1.2	2.2
None	2.2	0.0	1.3
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Unknown	.3	0.0	.2

309.

GENERAL ACTIVITY
(In the Home)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Active	82.4	90.3	85.8
Inactive, Passive	3.2	1.2	2.4
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Unknown	0.0	.4	.2

310.

HELPS IN THE HOME

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Helps Considerably	47.6	73.0	58.5
Helps Some	29.1	15.6	23.3
None	5.4	2.9	4.4
Doesn't Apply	14.4	8.0	11.6
Unknown	3.5	.4	2.2

311.

TYPE OF HELP AT HOME: I

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Tends Own Room, Clothes	10.5	4.2	7.8
Housework, Kitchen Help	4.8	2.1	3.6
Tends Children, Infants	1.0	0.0	.5
Own Room + Housework	44.4	56.5	49.6
Own Room + Children, etc.	.6	0.0	.4
Housework + Children	2.2	0.0	1.3
Room + Housework + Child.	2.9	24.9	12.4
None	12.8	3.4	8.8
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	6.4	.8	4.0

312.

TYPE OF HELP AT HOME: II

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Tends Infirm & Old Persons	0.0	.8	.4
Runs Errands, Goes Store	9.3	35.9	20.7
Simple Outside Chores	8.0	1.3	5.1
Infirm + Errands	.3	4.2	2.0
Infirm + Chores	0.0	0.0	0.0
Errands + Chores	55.9	33.3	46.2
Infirm + Errands + Chores	.3	3.8	1.8
None	8.3	12.3	10.0
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	3.5	.4	2.2

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
313.			
DEGREE RESPONSIBLE			
(Gen'l Social Abilities)			
s			
Fully Responsible	18.2	24.5	20.9
Resp. + Some Limitations	34.8	25.3	30.7
Partially Responsible	21.1	38.0	28.4
Limited	8.9	3.4	6.5
Very Limited	2.2	.8	1.6
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	.3	0.0	.2
314.			
CAN BE LEFT ALONE			
(Respns. in the Home)			
s			
Always	58.8	55.3	57.3
Usually	13.4	24.5	18.2
Sometimes, Short Periods	8.9	10.1	9.5
Seldom	1.6	1.3	1.5
Never	2.6	.8	1.8
Institutionalized	14.4	8.0	11.6
Uncertain	.3	0.0	.2
315.			
DEGREE OF MOBILITY			
(Since Discharge)			
s			
Full Responsibility	54.0	37.6	46.9
Considerable Distances	16.9	25.3	20.5
Ca. 5 Mi. Range	5.4	7.6	6.4
Familiar Area, Ca. 1 Mi.	4.5	5.5	4.9
Immediate Neighborhood	5.4	12.2	8.4
Own Yard or Nearby	9.3	6.3	8.0
None	1.0	.8	.9
Doesn't Apply	3.5	4.6	4.0

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
316.			
MODES OF TRAVEL: I			
s			
Pedestrian	1.6	3.8	2.5
Bicycle	0.0	0.0	0.0
Others' Cars, Public Trans	1.0	.4	.7
Ped. + Bike	.6	0.0	.4
Ped. + O's Cars etc.	80.5	88.2	83.8
Bike + O's Cars etc.	.3	0.0	.2
Ped. + Bike + O's Cars etc.	12.1	2.5	8.0
None of Above Modes	3.8	5.1	4.4
317.			
MODES OF TRAVEL: II			
s			
Mo. Vehic. (Off Pub. Roads)	3.5	1.3	2.5
Has Driver's License	17.9	4.2	12.0
Boat	1.6	0.0	.9
Car Driver's Lic + Boat	.6	0.0	.4
None of Above Modes	74.4	92.8	82.4
Uncertain	1.9	1.7	1.8
318.			
EXTENT OF TRAVEL: I			
(Within the State)			
s			
None	4.5	5.1	4.7
Neighborhood Only	.3	2.1	1.1
Within Own County	2.9	3.0	2.9
Through the State	68.1	59.5	64.3
Co. & St, Accomp. by Others (Semi-Dependent)	24.3	30.4	26.9

319.

EXTENT OF TRAVEL: II
(USA, Out of State)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	47.9	51.1	49.3
New England States	21.1	19.8	20.5
East of Miss. R.	15.3	10.1	13.1
East & West of Miss. R.	5.1	.8	3.3
Travel Accomp. by Others (Semi-Dependent)	10.5	18.1	13.8

320.

TRAVEL OUTSIDE USA
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Not Outside	87.82	84.16	86.25
Canada	7.50	5.83	6.79
Canada (Accompanied)	2.19	10.00	5.54
Canada & Mexico	.63	0.00	.36
Germany (Accompanied)	.31	0.00	.18
Europe (Merchant Marine)	.31	0.00	.18
Armed Services Overseas	.94	0.00	.54
Uncertain	.31	0.00	.18

321.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES: I
(Outside the Home)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Local Walks	2.9	4.2	3.5
Hunting - Fishing - Boating	.3	.4	.4
Visits Friends & Rels.	17.3	23.6	20.0
Walks + Hunting, etc.	1.3	0.0	.7
Walks + Visits	22.4	49.4	34.0
Hunting, etc. + Visits	12.8	3.0	8.5
Walks + Hunting + Visits	32.6	11.0	23.3
None	8.6	8.0	8.4
Uncertain	1.9	.4	1.3

322.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES: II
(Outside the Home)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Publ. Places, Shops, Bowlg	26.5	33.3	29.5
Movies, Ballgames, etc.	1.0	0.0	.5
Recreational Centers	.3	0.0	.2
Publ. Pl. + Movies, etc.	35.5	34.2	34.9
Publ. Pl. + Recr. Ctrs.	3.5	5.1	4.2
Movies etc. + Rec. Ctrs.	1.0	0.0	.5
Publ.Pl. + Flix + Rec.Ctrs.	21.4	14.8	18.5
None	9.3	12.7	10.7
Uncertain	1.6	0.0	.9

Tables 323 to 353, which follow, describe extra-domiciliary social relationships and social involvements. Friends, relatives, associations, etc. referred to are entirely separate and distinct from those intra-domiciliary persons and relationships described in certain earlier tables, and identified in table titles as being domiciliary in character.

323.

SOCIAL NETWORK EXTENT
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Includes Friends Only	8.3	11.4	9.7
Includes Relatives Only	11.2	11.0	11.1
Friends & Relatives	62.9	65.7	64.1
None Outside the Home	3.5	5.1	4.2
Doesn't Apply (Inst. etc.)	13.7	6.8	10.7
Unknown	.3	0.0	.2

324.

RELS ALSO DISCHARGEES
(In Soc. Network of Rels)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Few Rels Are Dischargees	11.5	18.2	14.4
Some	7.3	11.0	8.9
Most	1.3	2.1	1.6
All	.3	.4	.4
None, or Has No Rels	65.8	61.0	63.8
Doesn't Apply (Inst. etc.)	13.7	6.8	10.7
Unknown	0.0	.4	.2

325.

FRIENDS ALSC DISCHARGEES
(In Soc. Netw. of Friends)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Few Frs. Are Dischargees	17.6	18.2	17.9
Some	16.0	20.8	18.0
Most	6.1	5.9	6.0
All	0.0	0.0	0.0
None, or Has No Friends	46.0	47.9	46.8
Doesn't Apply (Inst. etc.)	13.7	6.8	10.7
Unknown	.6	.4	.5

326.

SOC. CLASS OF RELATIVES
(In Soc. Netw. of Rels)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper	0.0	0.0	0.0
Upper Middle	1.0	0.0	.5
Middle	3.8	3.4	3.6
Lower Middle	8.9	8.1	8.6
Lower	38.0	39.4	38.6
Lower to Nadir	19.2	21.2	20.0
Nadir	1.9	3.8	2.7
No Rels & Doesn't Apply	25.2	22.5	24.0
Uncertain	1.9	1.7	1.8

327.

SOC. CLASS OF RELATIVES
(In Addit. to Table 326)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper	0.0	0.0	0.0
Upper Middle	0.0	0.0	0.0
Middle	1.6	.8	1.3
Lower Middle	4.2	5.1	4.6
Lower	5.4	3.4	4.6
Lower to Nadir	16.3	19.9	17.9
Nadir	0.0	0.0	0.0
No O.Soc.Cl, No Rels, D.A.	70.3	69.1	69.8
Uncertain	2.2	1.7	2.0

328.

SOC. CLASS OF FRIENDS
(In Soc. Netw. of Frs.)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper	0.0	0.0	0.0
Upper Middle	0.0	.4	.2
Middle	3.2	5.5	4.2
Lower Middle	8.0	8.5	8.2
Lower	42.2	42.4	42.3
Lower to Nadir	15.7	15.7	15.7
Nadir	1.3	3.8	2.4
No Frs. & Doesn't Apply	28.1	22.5	25.7
Uncertain	1.6	1.3	1.5

329.

SOC. CLASS OF FRIENDS
(In Addit. to Table 328)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Upper	0.0	0.0	0.0
Upper Middle	.6	.4	.5
Middle	1.3	3.0	2.0
Lower Middle	5.1	5.1	5.1
Lower	6.4	7.2	6.7
Lower to Nadir	21.4	24.2	22.6
Nadir	0.0	.4	.2
No O.Soc.Cl, No Frs, D.A.	63.6	58.5	61.4
Uncertain	1.6	1.3	1.5

330.

AGES OF RELATIVES: I
(Junior Groups)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Younger Children (1-6 Yrs)	1.3	1.3	1.3
Older Children (7-12 Yrs)	0.0	.8	.4
Teenagers (13-19 Yrs)	2.6	.8	1.8
Younger & Older Ch.	.6	.4	.5
Younger Ch. & Teens	0.0	0.0	0.0
Older Ch. & Teens	.6	0.0	.4
Younger, Older & Teens	3.2	3.8	3.5
All Jrs. in Table 332	42.2	39.0	40.8
No Jr. Rels, or No Rels	47.0	51.3	48.8
Uncertain	2.6	2.5	2.6

331.

AGES OF RELATIVES: II
(Active Adult Years)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Younger Adults (20-34 Yrs)	2.2	1.7	2.0
Middle Group (35-54 Yrs)	7.3	5.9	6.7
Older Adults (55-69 Yrs)	3.5	5.1	4.2
Younger & Middle	4.5	3.8	4.2
Younger & Older	.6	1.7	1.1
Middle & Older	5.1	8.1	6.4
Younger, Middle & Older	6.4	9.3	7.7
All Adults in Tab. 332	42.2	39.0	40.8
No Adlt Rels, or No Rels	25.6	22.9	24.4
Uncertain	2.6	2.5	2.6

332.

AGES OF RELATIVES: III
(Seniors & Genl Coverage)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Seniors (70 + Yrs)	6.1	5.9	6.0
Genl Coverage, All Ages	42.2	39.0	40.8
No Grp III Rels, or No Rels	49.1	52.6	50.6
Uncertain	2.6	2.5	2.6

333.

AGES OF FRIENDS: I
(Junior Groups)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Younger Children (1-6 Yrs)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Older Children (7-12 Yrs)	1.0	.4	.7
Teenagers (13-19 Yrs)	4.5	1.3	3.1
Younger & Older Ch.	.6	.4	.5
Younger Ch. & Teens	0.0	0.0	0.0
Older Ch. & Teens	.3	0.0	.2
Younger, Older & Teens	.3	0.0	.2
All Jrs. in Table 335	27.8	30.9	29.1
No Jr. Frs, or No Frs.	62.6	62.7	62.7
Uncertain	2.9	4.2	3.5

6

334.

AGES OF FRIENDS: II
(Active Adult Years)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Younger Adults (20-34 Yrs)	14.1	6.8	10.9
Middle Group (35-54 Yrs)	7.7	13.6	10.2
Older Adults (55-69 Yrs)	2.2	3.0	2.6
Younger & Middle	8.0	5.5	6.9
Younger & Older	.3	.4	.4
Middle & Older	3.8	8.1	5.6
Younger, Middle & Older	1.9	4.7	3.1
All Adults in Tab. 335	27.8	30.9	29.1
No Adlt Frs, or No Frs.	31.3	22.9	27.7
Uncertain	2.9	4.2	3.5

335.

AGES OF FRIENDS: III
(Seniors & Genl Coverage)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Seniors (70 + Yrs)	1.9	4.2	2.9
Genl Coverage, All Ages	27.8	30.9	29.1
No Grp III Frs, or No Frs.	67.4	60.6	64.5
Uncertain	2.9	4.2	3.5

336.

TYPE OF ASSCC.W.RELATIVES

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Steady Association	62.0	64.0	62.8
Transient	9.3	8.9	9.1
Wildly Vacillating	.6	2.5	1.5
Contd But Infrequent	1.6	.4	1.1
None, Nominal, or No Rels	25.6	23.3	24.6
Unknown	1.0	.8	.9

337.

TYPE OF ASSOC.W.RELATIVES
(In Addit. to Table 336)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Steady Association	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transient	13.1	14.4	13.7
Wildly Vacillating	2.2	.4	1.5
Contd But Infrequent	0.0	0.0	0.0
None, No Other, etc.	83.7	84.3	84.0
Unknown	1.0	.8	.9

338.

TYPE OF ASSOC. W. FRIENDS

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Steady Association	54.9	66.9	60.1
Transient	12.1	6.4	9.7
Wildly Vacillating	2.6	3.0	2.7
Contd But Infrequent	0.0	0.0	0.0
None, Nominal, or No Frs.	28.1	22.5	25.7
Unknown	2.2	1.3	1.8

339.

TYPE OF ASSOC. W. FRIENDS
(In Addit. to Table 338)

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
s			
Steady Association	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transient	7.3	7.2	7.3
Wildly Vacillating	1.3	.4	.9
Contd But Infrequent	0.0	0.0	0.0
None, No Other, etc.	89.2	91.1	90.0
Unknown	2.2	1.3	1.8

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
340.			
HAS FRIENDS CF OPP. SEX			
s			
Yes	43.1	55.9	48.6
No	39.6	35.2	37.7
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.7	6.8	10.7
Uncertain	3.5	2.1	2.9
341.			
INTEREST IN OPPOSITE SEX			
s			
No Interest	20.8	20.3	20.6
Slight Interest	18.2	8.9	14.2
Moderate Interest	3.5	4.7	4.0
Interest in Marriage	5.1	3.8	4.6
Marriage Likely	2.6	1.7	2.2
Marriage Unlikely	1.6	.4	1.1
Sex Rel. Possible	6.1	8.1	6.9
Already Is (Was) Married	20.1	38.1	27.9
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.7	6.8	10.7
Uncertain	8.3	7.2	7.8
342.			
NEIGHBORS' REACTIONS: I (Adults, to Dischargees)			
s			
Friendly	44.4	64.0	52.8
Indifferent	9.6	7.2	8.6
Hostile	1.3	.8	1.1
Friendly + Indiff.	8.0	6.8	7.5
Friendly + Fostile	4.8	3.0	4.0
Indiff. + Hostile	1.0	.8	.9
Friendly + Indiff + Hostile	1.9	0.0	1.1
Friendly + Fearful	.3	0.0	.2
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.7	6.8	10.7
Uncertain	15.0	10.6	13.1

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
343.			
NEIGHBORS' REACTIONS: II (Children, to Dischargee)			
s			
Friendly	44.1	64.0	52.6
Indifferent	9.9	6.8	8.6
Hostile	1.6	.8	1.3
Friendly ± Indiff.	6.7	5.5	6.2
Friendly + Hostile	1.9	3.0	2.4
Indiff. + Hostile	.6	.8	.7
Friendly + Indiff + Hostile	1.0	0.0	.5
Friendly + Fearful	.3	0.0	.2
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	15.3	7.6	12.0
Uncertain	18.5	11.4	15.5
344.			
FORMAL MEMBERSHIP (In Organized Groups)			
s			
Membership in Org. Grps.	51.4	61.4	55.7
No Membership	34.5	30.9	33.0
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc.	13.7	6.8	10.7
Unknown	.3	.8	.5
345.			
MULTIPLE MEMBERSHIP (In Organized Groups)			
m			
Memb. I Group Only	40.33	56.26	47.12
Memb. 2 Groups	10.63	6.25	8.77
Memb. 3 Groups	1.87	2.50	2.14
Memb. 4 Groups	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply, & None	46.25	34.17	41.07
Unknown	.63	.83	.71

346.

TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP

(In Organized Groups)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Business	.31	0.00	.18
Civic	.31	0.00	.18
Labor Unions	8.44	1.25	5.36
Fraternal Orders	.31	0.00	.18
Vets Assoc.	0.00	.42	.18
YMCA, YWCA	1.26	0.00	.72
Sport & Athletic Clubs	1.88	.84	1.43
Non-Relig. Social Orgs.	2.50	3.33	2.85
Relig & Semi-Rel Soc. Org.	1.56	7.08	3.93
Scouts	1.25	.42	.89
Church Membship, Unspec.	42.81	53.33	47.32
Belongs Ch, Attends Reg.	3.44	2.50	3.04
Attends Ch, Not Reg Mem.	2.50	5.00	3.57
Belongs Ch, Atts Occas.	1.87	2.09	1.97

NOTE: Multiple memberships are included in these figures while non-membership is not. (Total is not 100%)

347.

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION

(In 1st or Only Group)

s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Nominal	11.8	12.3	12.0
Slight	8.3	13.6	10.6
Moderate	8.9	10.6	9.7
Steady	21.4	27.1	23.9
Considerable	1.9	1.7	1.8
No Membership, None	46.6	33.1	40.8
Unknown	1.0	1.7	1.3

348.

DONATIONS TO CHURCH

(Given By Dischargee)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Regular Donations	23.44	27.92	25.36
Occasional Donations	8.75	17.50	12.50
Infrequent Donations	.31	.42	.36
Donations, Unspecif.	1.56	1.25	1.43
Apparently None	49.38	43.33	46.79
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.44	6.67	10.54
Unknown	3.13	2.92	3.04

349.

DONATIONS TO CHARITIES

(Given By Dischargee)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Regular Donations	3.44	5.00	4.11
Occasional Donations	19.38	17.08	18.39
Infrequent Donations	.31	0.00	.18
Donations, Unspecif.	.31	.42	.36
Apparently None	54.06	62.08	57.50
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.44	6.67	10.54
Unknown	9.06	8.75	8.93

350.

PERSONAL GIFTS, ETC.

(Given By Dischargee)

m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
To Adult Relatives	14.38	12.50	13.57
To Adult & Child Rels.	20.94	27.08	23.57
To Friends	4.69	9.17	6.61
To Friends & Relatives	14.06	24.17	18.39
Apparently None	28.44	17.50	23.75
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.44	6.67	10.54
Unknown	4.06	2.92	3.57

351.

SAVINGS ACCUMULATED
(By Dischargee)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Has Savings	26.8	44.9	34.6
No Savings	52.7	44.9	49.4
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.7	6.8	10.7
Unknown	6.7	3.4	5.3

352.

AMOUNT OF SAVINGS

m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
$ 1 - $ 24	1.56	3.33	2.32
25 - 49	1.88	4.58	3.04
50 - 99	1.88	5.83	3.57
100 - 199	5.31	3.33	4.46
200 - 299	.94	2.50	1.61
300 - 499	1.56	2.92	2.14
500 - 749	3.13	3.33	3.21
750 - 999	.94	1.25	1.07
1,000 - 1,499	2.19	2.92	2.50
1,500 - 2,999	1.25	2.08	1.61
3,000 & over	0.00	1.67	.71
Saved Amount Uncertain	6.11	11.18	8.27
No Savings	53.13	45.00	49.64
Doesn't Apply, Inst, etc	13.44	6.67	10.54
Unknown	6.70	3.40	5.30

353.

DEBTS AND AMOUNTS
(Acquired By Dischargee)

m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Debts	62.19	73.33	66.96
$ 1 - $ 24	0.00	2.08	.89
25 - 49	.31	.42	.36
50 - 99	2.19	1.25	1.79
100 - 199	3.13	1.67	2.50
200 - 299	2.50	1.25	1.96
300 - 499	2.19	2.50	2.32
500 - 749	1.25	2.08	1.61
750 - 999	.94	.83	.89
1,000 - 1,499	.63	.42	.54
1,500 - 2,999	.94	1.25	1.07
3,000 & over	0.00	0.00	0.00
Amount of Debt Uncertain	2.19	.83	1.61
Doesn't Apply	13.44	6.67	10.54
Unknown	8.12	5.42	6.97

354.

DOMESTIC ANIMALS, PETS
(Kept By Dischargee)

s	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Dog(s), Cat(s), or Unspec.	28.8	37.3	32.4
Parakeet, Canary, etc.	1.0	3.4	2.0
Poultry, Cattle	1.9	0.0	1.1
Rabbits	.6	.8	.7
Pig	.3	0.0	.2
Monkey	.3	0.0	.2
Horse or Pony	.3	0.0	.2
No Animals or Pets	43.5	43.6	43.5
Doesn't Apply	13.7	6.8	10.7
Uncertain	9.6	8.1	8.9

Tables 355 through 366, which follow, deal with the post-discharge absence or presence of types of informal difficulties, behavior and personality problems, etc., as reported by various sources, largely informal and non-official. The information in these tables is distinct and separate from that in later tables which deal with the absence and presence of post-discharge formal difficulties, particularly police contacts, as reported by various official sources.

355.

DEGREE TROUBLESOME
(General Behavior)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None, Not at All	51.25	54.58	52.68
None to Slight	.31	0.00	.18
Slight	17.50	18.33	17.86
Slight to Moderate	1.88	2.08	1.96
Moderate	10.63	7.92	9.46
Mod. to Consid.	4.06	1.67	3.04
Considerable	7.81	2.92	5.71
Consid. to Excess	.63	.42	.54
Excessive	2.50	1.67	2.14
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Uncertain	2.19	7.08	4.29

356.

SOURCE OF OPINION
(In Table 355)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Spouse	6.56	8.75	7.50
Dischargee's Parent(s)	27.81	12.50	21.25
Dischargee's Relatives	19.06	15.00	17.32
Boarding Family	7.50	8.33	7.86
Friends	1.88	1.67	1.79
Neighbors	.63	0.00	.36
Ex-Landlord	.31	0.00	.18
Employer	5.94	11.67	8.39
Ex-Employer	1.88	2.08	1.96
Emplyr Who is Relative	0.00	.42	.18
Intervwr (Misc, Data-Based)	22.19	23.75	22.86
Instit. Report	1.56	2.92	2.14
Parole Officer	.63	0.00	.36
Social Worker	0.00	2.08	.89
Police Officer, etc.	.31	0.00	.18
Town, Welfare Officials	.31	.42	.36
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Unknown	2.19	7.08	4.29

357.

POOR INTERPERS BEHAVIORS
(Freq. of Non-Sex Types)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Such Behaviors	42.19	50.42	45.71
Rare (Once)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Few (2-5 Times)	1.56	4.17	2.68
Some (6-10)	31.56	25.00	28.75
Considerable (11-20)	6.56	4.17	5.54
Many (21 & More)	10.31	6.25	8.57
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Uncertain	6.56	6.67	6.61

358.

TYPES OF BEHAVIORS
(In Table 357)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Such Behaviors	42.19	50.42	45.71
Child Neglect & Abuse	0.00	2.08	.89
Disturbing Behavior	3.13	0.00	1.79
Bizarre Behavior	.31	.42	.36
Disruptive	.63	0.00	.36
Hyperactive	3.13	.83	2.14
Apathetic, Withdrawn	.31	0.00	.18
Moody	3.13	3.33	3.21
Secretive	.63	0.00	.36
Irresponsible	3.13	2.08	2.68
Suspicious	.31	0.00	.18
Very Withdrawn	1.25	.42	.89
Argumentative	1.25	.83	1.07
Verbal Insults	.94	0.00	.54
Overly Critical	.63	0.00	.36
Jealous Troublemaking	0.00	.42	.18
Arrogance	.31	.42	.36
Troubles w. Parents	0.00	.42	.18
Troubles w. Sibs	.31	0.00	.18
Troubles w. Family	.31	0.00	.18
Temperamental	7.19	7.92	7.50
Tantrums	8.75	13.75	10.89
Domineering	0.00	.42	.18
Stubborn	.94	1.67	1.25
Independent	0.00	.42	.18
Hostile	3.13	0.00	1.79
Threats of Viol. (Weapon)	.63	0.00	.36
Violence, Grabs, Throws etc	.31	0.00	.18
Viol., Physical Fights	2.19	.83	1.61
Makes Demands	.63	0.00	.36
Exploiting, Successful	.94	.83	.89
Depression	.31	1.25	.71
Feels Inadequate	.31	.42	.36
Escape Threats	0.00	.42	.18
Minor School Problems	.31	0.00	.18
Heavy Drinker	4.38	.42	2.68
Week-end Alcohol Parties	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Uncertain	6.56	6.67	6.61

359. PROPERTY DESTRUCTION (Frequency of Events) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Property Destruction	71.56	83.75	76.79
Rare (Once)	.63	0.00	.36
Few (2-5 Times)	2.19	2.08	2.14
Some (6-10)	6.88	2.08	4.82
Considerable (11-20)	.31	.42	.36
Many (21 & More)	.94	.42	.71
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Uncertain	16.25	7.92	12.68

360. PROPERTY THEFT (Frequency of Events) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Property Theft	66.25	80.00	72.14
Rare (Once)	0.00	.42	.18
Few (2-5 Times)	2.81	1.67	2.32
Some (6-10)	10.94	2.50	7.32
Considerable (11-20)	2.19	0.00	1.25
Many (21 & More)	1.25	0.00	.71
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
Uncertain	15.31	12.08	13.93

361. SEX RELATED BEHAVIORS (Frequ. of Events) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	32.50	47.08	38.75
Rare (One)	1.25	1.67	1.43
Few (2-5)	2.19	2.92	2.50
Some (6-10)	14.69	10.83	13.04
Considerable (11-20)	1.25	1.67	1.43
Many (21 & Over)	2.19	2.92	2.50
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	44.69	29.58	38.21

362. TYPES OF BEHAVIORS (In Table 361) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	32.50	47.08	38.75
Promiscuity	0.00	3.75	1.61
Fornication	4.69	10.42	7.14
Extramarital	.63	1.25	.89
Sex with Minor	1.88	0.00	1.07
Child Molesting	1.25	0.00	.71
Excess Intrst in Minors	1.25	0.00	.71
Sex Advances on Rels	1.25	.42	.89
Illegit Pregnancy	0.00	3.75	1.61
Abortion	0.00	.42	.18
Homosexual Activities	7.19	0.00	4.11
Peeping Tom	1.25	0.00	.71
Masturbation	1.56	0.00	.89
Exhibitionism	.63	0.00	.36
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	44.69	29.58	38.21

363. ESCAPES & AVOIDANCES (Frequency of Events) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	62.19	75.42	67.86
Rare (One)	.94	.83	.89
Few (2-5)	1.25	2.08	1.61
Some (6-10)	12.81	3.75	8.93
Considerable (11-20)	2.19	.42	1.43
Many (21 & Over)	4.69	1.25	3.21
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	14.69	12.92	13.93

364. TYPES OF BEHAVIORS (In Table 363) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	62.19	75.42	67.86
Quits Job	8.44	2.92	6.07
Excess Absenteeism	.94	0.00	.54
AWOL	.63	0.00	.36
Escape From Instit.	1.56	0.00	.89
Escape From Authorities	.94	0.00	.54
To Specific Goal	1.25	.42	.89
Leaves Home w/o Telling	.63	.42	.54
Runs Away From Home	.94	.83	.89
Leaves Town w/o Telling	.94	0.00	.54
Drifter	1.88	.42	1.25
Roaming the Streets	3.13	2.50	2.86
Wanders off	.31	.83	.54
Unspecified	.31	0.00	.18
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	14.69	12.92	13.93

365. EXPLOITATION BY OTHERS (Frequency of Events) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	48.75	51.67	50.00
Rare (Once)	1.56	2.92	2.14
Few (2-5 Times)	6.25	4.17	5.36
Some (6-10)	5.00	5.42	5.18
Considerable (11-20)	.31	.42	.36
Many (21 & More)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Severe, 1 Episode	1.88	2.08	1.96
Severe, 2 Episodes	.31	.42	.36
Severe, 3 Episodes	0.00	.42	.18
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	34.69	29.17	32.32

366. TYPES OF EXPLOITATION (In Table 365) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	48.75	51.67	50.00
Financial, By Kin	3.13	2.08	2.68
Financial, By Others	3.75	2.08	3.04
Financial, By Kin & Others	.31	0.00	.18
Employment (Slave Wages)	5.31	5.42	5.36
Not Paid Wages Due	.31	1.25	.71
Sexual	.31	4.58	2.14
Physical Abuse	.63	0.00	.36
Butt of Teasing	.63	0.00	.36
To a Criminal Degree	.94	.42	.71
Doesn't Apply	1.25	3.33	2.14
No Information	34.69	29.17	32.32

367. POLICE CONTACT RECORDS (All Periods) m	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
PREADMISSION			
None Listed	59.69	63.33	61.25
Misdeed Type	40.31	36.67	38.75
WHILE AT PINELAND			
None Listed	96.25	100.00	97.86
Misdeed Type	3.75	0.00	2.14
POST-DISCHARGE			
None Listed	65.94	95.42	78.57
Misdeed Type	33.12	4.16	20.72
Unknown	.94	.42	.71

368.

TOTAL POLICE CONTACTS
(None, Single, & Multiple)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Recorded Contacts	65.93	95.41	78.57
One Police Contact Only	12.18	2.50	8.03
Two Police Contacts Only	7.18	1.66	4.82
Three	4.68	.41	2.85
Four	4.06	0.00	2.32
Five	1.25	0.00	.71
Six	1.25	0.00	.71
Seven	.62	0.00	.36
Eight	.93	0.00	.54
Nine	.31	0.00	.18
Ten	.31	0.00	.18
Eleven	0.00	0.00	0.00
Twelve	.31	0.00	.18
Thirteen or More	.93	0.00	.54

In Tables 369 through 372, which follow, the categories of offenses are those used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and described in detail in the F.B.I. Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook.

369.

1ST OR ONLY POLICE CONTACT
(Type of Charge)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Murder, Non Negl. Mansl.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Manslaughter, Negligence	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rape	.91	0.00	.83
Robbery	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aggravated Assault	2.75	0.00	2.50
Burglary, Break, Enter	10.09	0.00	9.16
Larceny-Theft	11.92	9.09	11.66
Auto Theft	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Assaults	9.17	9.09	9.16
Forgery, Counterfeiting	5.50	0.00	5.00
Embezzlement & Fraud	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stolen Property - Buy, Sell	0.00	0.00	0.00
Weapons, Possession	.91	0.00	.83
Prostitution, Comm. Vice	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Sex Offenses	9.17	27.27	10.83
Offenses Vs. Family & Ch.	.91	0.00	.83
Narcotic Drug Law	0.00	0.00	0.00
Liquor Laws	3.66	0.00	3.33
Drunkenness	11.00	9.09	10.83
Disorderly Conduct	1.83	0.00	1.66
Vagrancy	10.09	9.09	10.00
Gambling	0.00	0.00	0.00
Driving While Intoxicated	.91	0.00	.83
Viol. Road & Driving Laws	.91	0.00	.83
Parking Violations	0.00	0.00	0.00
O. Viol. Traff & Mo Vehic	4.58	0.00	4.16
All Other Offenses	6.42	9.09	6.66
Minor Offenses Possible	2.75	9.09	3.33
Suspicion, Then Release	6.42	18.18	7.50

NOTE: These percentages are based not on total number of dischargees but on counts for 1st or only police contacts alone to equal 100%. Counts are: Males: 109 Females: 11 Total: 120

370.

SECOND POLICE CONTACT
(Type of Charge)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Murder, Non Negl. Mansl.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Manslaughter, Negligence	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rape	1.40	0.00	1.31
Robbery	1.40	0.00	1.31
Aggravated Assault	1.40	0.00	1.31
Burglary, Break, Enter	4.22	0.00	3.94
Larceny-Theft	16.90	40.00	18.42
Auto Theft	1.40	0.00	1.31
Other Assaults	4.22	0.00	3.94
Forgery, Counterfeiting	2.81	0.00	2.63
Embezzlement & Fraud	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stolen Property - Buy, Sell	1.40	0.00	1.31
Weapons, Possession	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prostitution, Comm. Vice	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Sex Offenses	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offenses Vs. Family & Ch.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Narcotic Drug Law	0.00	0.00	0.00
Liquor Laws	1.40	0.00	1.31
Drunkenness	16.90	0.00	15.78
Disorderly Conduct	7.04	20.00	7.89
Vagrancy	11.26	20.00	11.84
Gambling	0.00	0.00	0.00
Driving While Intoxicated	2.81	0.00	2.63
Viol. Road & Driving Laws	2.81	0.00	2.63
Parking Violations	0.00	0.00	0.00
O. Viol. Traff & Mo Vehic	7.04	0.00	6.57
All Other Offenses	7.04	0.00	6.57
Minor Offenses Possible	8.45	20.00	9.21
Suspicion, Then Release	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: These percentages are based on counts for second police contacts alone to equal 100%. Counts are:
Males: 71 Females: 5 Total: 76

371.

THIRD POLICE CONTACT
(Type of Charge)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Murder, Non Negl. Mansl.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Manslaughter, Negligence	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rape	0.00	0.00	0.00
Robbery	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aggravated Assault	2.12	0.00	2.08
Burglary, Break, Enter	19.14	0.00	18.75
Larceny-Theft	6.38	100.00	8.33
Auto Theft	4.25	0.00	4.16
Other Assaults	6.38	0.00	6.25
Forgery, Counterfeiting	4.25	0.00	4.16
Embezzlement & Fraud	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stolen Property - Buy, Sell	0.00	0.00	0.00
Weapons, Possession	0.00	0.00	0.00
Prostitution, Comm. Vice	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Sex Offenses	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offenses Vs. Family & Ch.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Narcotic Drug Law	0.00	0.00	0.00
Liquor Laws	2.12	0.00	2.08
Drunkenness	14.89	0.00	14.58
Disorderly Conduct	2.12	0.00	2.08
Vagrancy	14.89	0.00	14.58
Gambling	0.00	0.00	0.00
Driving While Intoxicated	0.00	0.00	0.00
Viol. Road & Driving Laws	2.12	0.00	2.08
Parking Violations	0.00	0.00	0.00
O. Viol. Traff & Mo Vehic	6.38	0.00	6.25
All Other Offenses	2.12	0.00	2.08
Minor Offenses Possible	6.38	0.00	6.25
Suspicion, Then Release	6.38	0.00	6.25

NOTE: These percentages are based on counts for third police contacts alone to equal 100%. Counts are:
Males: 47 Females: 1 Total: 48

372.

FREQUENCY OF CHARGES
(For All Police Contacts)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Murder, Non Negl. Mansl.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Manslaughter, Negligence	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rape	.60	0.00	.57
Robbery	.90	0.00	.86
Aggravated Assault	2.11	0.00	2.01
Burglary, Break, Enter	9.96	0.00	9.48
Larceny-Theft	10.87	23.52	11.49
Auto Theft	2.41	0.00	2.29
Other Assaults	5.74	5.88	5.74
Forgery, Counterfeiting	4.22	0.00	4.02
Embezzlement & Fraud	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stolen Property - Buy, Sell	.30	0.00	.28
Weapons, Possession	.60	0.00	.57
Prostitution, Comm. Vice	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Sex Offenses	3.92	17.64	4.59
Offenses Vs. Family & Ch.	.60	0.00	.57
Narcotic Drug Law	0.00	0.00	0.00
Liquor Laws	1.81	0.00	1.72
Drunkenness	15.40	5.88	14.94
Disorderly Conduct	3.92	5.88	4.02
Vagrancy	12.08	11.76	12.06
Gambling	0.00	0.00	0.00
Driving While Intoxicated	1.51	0.00	1.43
Viol. Road & Driving Laws	1.51	0.00	1.43
Parking Violations	0.00	0.00	0.00
O. Viol. Traffic & Mo Vehic	6.04	0.00	5.74
All Other Offenses	6.64	5.88	6.60
Minor Offenses Possible	4.53	11.76	4.88
Suspicion, Then Release	4.22	11.76	4.59

NOTE: These percentages are based not on individuals but on total number of all police contacts by all dischargees having contacts. Counts are:
m: By Males: 331   By Females: 17   By M & F: 348
s: " " 315   " " 16   " " " 331

373.

DATES OF CHARGES
(For All Police Contacts)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1953	.90	0.00	.86
1954	.90	0.00	.86
1955	4.22	0.00	4.02
1956	2.41	0.00	2.29
1957	4.53	5.88	4.59
1958	5.13	5.88	5.17
1959	9.06	11.76	9.19
1960	15.40	29.41	16.09
1961	14.80	17.64	14.94
1962	11.17	0.00	10.63
1963	9.66	11.76	9.77
1964	12.38	5.88	12.06
1965	3.62	0.00	3.44
Date Uncertain	5.74	11.76	6.03

See *Note* for Table 372

374.

DISPOSITIONS OF CHARGES
(For All Police Contacts)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Not Guilty, Mental Defect	1.0	0.0	.9
Filed	1.6	6.3	1.8
Released	19.0	18.8	19.0
Not Guilty	.6	0.0	.6
Probation, Parole	6.3	12.5	6.6
Sentenced Prison	45.1	37.5	44.7
Fined	12.4	0.0	11.8
Probation, Then Sentence	1.0	0.0	.9
Suspended Sentence	3.2	6.3	3.3
Other	1.9	6.3	2.1
Uncertain	7.9	12.5	8.2

See *Note* for Table 372

375.

FINES FOR CHARGES
(For All Police Contacts)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	73.41	76.47	73.56
\$ 1 - \$ 5	.60	0.00	.57
6 - 10	4.22	0.00	4.02
11 - 25	5.13	0.00	4.88
26 - 50	1.20	5.88	1.43
51 - 75	.60	0.00	.57
76 - 100	1.20	0.00	1.14
101 - 150	2.11	0.00	2.01
151 - 200	0.00	0.00	0.00
201 - 300	.30	0.00	.28
Uncertain	11.17	17.64	11.49

See Note for Table 372

376.

INCARCERAT'N FOR CHARGES
(For All Police Contacts)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
None	43.59	47.08	43.81
To 7 Days	.60	0.00	.57
To 15 Days	3.62	0.00	3.44
To 30 Days	7.55	0.00	7.18
To 60 Days	1.81	0.00	1.72
To 90 Days	2.11	5.88	2.29
To 4,5 Months	.30	0.00	.28
6 Months	2.11	0.00	2.01
6 Mo. to Additional	6.64	0.00	6.32
9 Months	.60	0.00	.57
10 Mo. to Additional	.30	0.00	.28
1 Year	.60	0.00	.57
1 Yr. to Additional	8.15	0.00	7.75
1½ Yr. to Additional	1.51	0.00	1.43
2 Years	.30	0.00	.28
2 Yrs. to Additional	1.51	0.00	1.43
2½ Yrs. to Additional	.30	0.00	.28
3 Years	.30	5.88	.57
3 Yrs. to Additional	.30	0.00	.28
4 Yrs. to Additional	.60	0.00	.57
5 Yrs. to Additional	1.20	0.00	1.14
Indefinite Sentence	2.41	23.52	3.44
Sentence Unclear	13.59	17.64	13.79

See Note for Table 372

377.

TYPE OF PRISON, ETC.
(For All Police Contacts)
s

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
No Prison Sentence	44.4	50.0	44.7
Town, City, County Jail	19.7	6.3	19.0
Reform School	1.3	0.0	1.2
Reformatory	13.3	31.2	14.2
State Prison	9.8	0.0	9.4
Military	.3	0.0	.3
To Pineland or O. Inst.	1.0	0.0	.9
Uncertain	10.2	12.5	10.3

See Note for Table 372

378.

STATE OF OCCURRENCE
(For All Police Contacts)
m

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
Maine	80.96	82.35	81.03
New Hampshire	.90	5.88	1.14
Massachusetts	3.02	0.00	2.87
Rhode Island	.60	0.00	.57
Connecticut	2.41	0.00	2.29
New York	.60	0.00	.57
New Jersey	.60	0.00	.57
Pennsylvania	1.51	0.00	1.43
Washington, D.C.	.60	0.00	.57
Maryland	.30	0.00	.28
Florida	.30	0.00	.28
Indiana	.30	0.00	.28
Nebraska	.30	0.00	.28
Wyoming	.30	0.00	.28
So. Dakota	.30	0.00	.28
Arizona	.60	0.00	.57
Nevada	.60	0.00	.57
California	1.51	0.00	1.43
Uncertain	4.22	11.76	4.59

See Note for Table 372